This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

A 872,547

THE

DUBLIN REVIEW.

8 S 714

VOL. XV. NEW SERIES.

67

JULY——OCTOBER,

MDCCCLXX.

LONDON:

BURNS, OATES, & CO., 17 & 18, PORTMAN STREET,

AND 63 PATERNOSTER ROW.

DERBY: RICHARDSON & SONS.

DUBLIN: JAMES DUFFY; W. B. KELLY.

1870.

AP
4
D82

CONTENTS.

ART. I.—PROTESTANT LONDON.

Frightful moral state of London 1
Neglected children 2
Their mothers 5
Baby-farming 6
Professional thieves 7
Other curses 9
Origin and remedies of this state of society 11
Action of the Catholic and Anglican Churches 18
Paris and London 23
Office of legislation 25

ART. II.—CHRONICLE OF EVESHAM ABBEY.

Early history of Evesham Abbey 26
Roger Norreys is made abbot 31
Visitation of the bishop declined 33
Lawsuit in consequence 37
The Abbey sends proctors to Rome to defend its rights . . . 41
Temporary defeat of the monks 42
The cause is pleaded before Innocent III. 48
And sentence is given in favour of the Abbey 49
The Bishop of Worcester claims the churches of the Vale . . . 50
The monks desert the Abbey to escape the tyranny of the abbot . . 53
The Legate of the Pope visits the Abbey and deposes Roger Norreys . 55

ART. III.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Antiquity of the controversy 57
The Council of Trent 58
S. Clement's evidence 59
The Fathers 60
S. Augustine 64

ART. III.—THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

Institutions on their trial 319
The trial of the Church 320
Its work in America 322
The character of the New England States 323
Puritan legislation against the Church 325
The Blue Laws of Massachusetts and the Connecticut code . . . 327
Dealings of the Pilgrim Fathers with the native Indians . . . 330
Their system of Slavery 332
Infidelity and Superstition at present existing in New England . . 333
The Catholic Church in Massachusetts 334
The dioceses of Hartford, Portland, and Burlington 335
The Church in the State of New York. 337
The Religious History of Virginia and Maryland 339
Character of the American Protestant Episcopal Church . . . 343
The Church in the Valley of the Mississippi 346
In the North-Western States 348
In the Western and South-Western States 350
Nationalities of the American Episcopate 351
The Native Indians 352
Conversions in America 353

ART. IV.—LACORDAIRE AND THE CONFERENCES OF NOTRE DAME.

Lacordaire's first appearance at Rome 356
His religious attitude 358
His independence 360
His natural character 362
State of France in Lacordaire's youth 363
His ordination 365
His genius 366
His parting with Lamennais 368
His first sermon 369
The Collége Stanislas 370
The Conferences at Notre Dame 372
Lacordaire's relation to his audience 374
His pictures of Christianity 377
His Conferences on the Church 379
On Catholic Doctrine 380
On Jesus Christ 381
The Revolution of 1848 383
His subsequent Conferences 384
Quality of his oratory 387
His style 390
His appearance in the Pulpit 392

ART. V.—THE ASSUMPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY AN APOSTOLICAL TRADITION.

The Council and the doctrine of the Assumption 394
Character of Vaccari's work 395
Scope of the present paper 397
Liturgical proof 399
Proof from the Office 402
Suarez as a test of the Schola 405
Universality of the Festival 406
The Homilies 410
Objections from S. Ildephonsus and others 412
Doctrine of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries 417
Tradition alike constant and complete 417
Traceable to Fourth Century 418
Contained in one of the two Rules of Faith 422
Dr. Newman on a passage in the Apocalypse 424
Relation of the doctrines of the Assumption and Immaculate Conception 427
Reasons for desiring a Definition 429

ART. VI.—JANE AUSTEN AND HER NOVELS.

Modest obscurity of Miss Austen's life 430
Her family 432
Her studies 433
Characteristics of her style 435
Her female characters 436
Comparison with Thackeray and Mrs. Gaskell 437
Her descriptive powers 438
Novels 441
Her cheerfulness 442
Comparison with Goldsmith 445
Her plots 446
Mrs. Norris 448
Miss Austen's "Fools" 450
Her Clerical Portraits 453

ART. VII.—THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

Protestant view of Church Unity forty years ago 458
Anglican view at present 462
Position of the Unionists 464
Mr. Rhodes on their Theory 468
Arguments that Catholics have remained separated from Visible Unity . 471
Historical Argument 475

ART. VIII.—THE FALL OF THE FRENCH EMPIRE.

Appalling suddenness of the Empire's collapse 479
Sedan 480
The French Army 481
Amazing growth of Prussian Power 484
The Emperor's personal action 487
The Revolution and Voltaire's Statue 489
The Voltairian Government 491
Predictions concerning France 493
The Situation at Rome 494

ART. IX.—FIRST DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF GOD. 498

ART. X.—PAPAL BRIEF TO DR. WARD. 508

ART. XI.—NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Mr. Steuart Rose's "Ignatius Loyola". 510
Mr. Church's Life of S. Anselm 513
The Catechism Illustrated 522
M. Bonneau's Life of Madame de Beauharnais de Miramion . . . 528
Dr. Rock's Textile Fabrics in South Kensington Museum . . . 534
Mr. Wilson's Lizzie Wentworth 539

THE

DUBLIN REVIEW.

JULY, 1870.

ART. I.—PROTESTANT LONDON.

The Seven Curses of London. By JAMES GREENWOOD, the "Amateur Casual." London: Stanley Rivers & Co.

MR. GREENWOOD'S is a very valuable book, because he knows London intimately, without having lost by familiarity his sense of that utter horror which its social and moral condition must surely excite in any man when he first becomes acquainted with it. This value can hardly be exaggerated. Nothing is so necessary as to impress upon every well-meaning man and woman in England what the real state of English society is. We are living over a volcano. It is impossible to believe that such a state of things can be permanent. The life-blood of our country is tainted by a deadly disease; how long it may retain possession without being fatal who can say. This is merely the natural view of the case. But the true view is not the natural but the supernatural; for, whatever things may appear, they really are, what they are in the eyes of God, and nothing else. The truly momentous question therefore is, whether His blessing will permanently rest upon a nation in which a social system, such as Mr. Greenwood exposes, is allowed to go on unchecked; and, whether the social and moral condition of London must not bring down judgment upon us, even if we were as yet unable to trace, upon merely natural principles, the danger which it involves.

Our author enters at once upon his subject. The first of the seven curses of London is its "neglected children," and the first words of his book (which begins without Preface or explanation) are these.

> It is a startling fact, that in England and Wales alone at the present time, the number of children under the age of sixteen, dependent more or less upon the parochial authorities for maintenance, amounts to three hundred and fifty thousand.
>
> It is scarcely less startling to learn that annually more than a hundred thousand criminals emerge from the doors of the various prisons, that, for short time or long time, have been their homes, and with no more substantial

advice than to take care that they don't make their appearance there again, are turned adrift once more to face the world, unkind as when they last stole from it. This does not include our immense army of juvenile vagrants. How the information has been arrived at is more than I can tell; but it is an accepted fact, that daily, winter and summer, within the limits of our vast and wealthy city of London, there wander, destitute of proper guardianship, food, clothing, or employment, *a hundred thousand* boys and girls in fair training for the treadmill and the oakum-shed, and finally for Portland and the convict's mark" (p. 1).

This sentence is a fair specimen of the author's style. It has no special literary force or beauty, nay, there is often a want of order which suggests a less practised writer than he is said to be. In this extract, for instance, the number of convicts among us is introduced in the midst of his statistical statement about the number of neglected children. But the facts he states are so momentous, and he himself is so evidently impressed, nay, carried away by their terrible importance, that none but a cold-blooded critic will find leisure, when reading them, to think of the author's style, or of anything else. One hundred thousand children in our streets under regular training for a life of misery and crime. Consider for a moment what it means. Laws and police, prisons and punishments, will always be necessary, because in every generation there are those who "take to evil courses." They fall before the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil, and if unrestrained, would prey upon society. There will always be too many of this class; but its numbers will vary according to circumstances, and according to the wisdom and care shown in the education of the rising generation and the government of that already grown up. But it is ever to be remembered, that it is in addition to this class, that we have, according to our author, no less than a hundred thousand children training up for no other way of life, no other profession. It is, as if, like conquerors of old dividing the spoil of a city, we should first set apart a hundred thousand children as the devil's own share, and then go on, to try our chance with him, for good or evil, with regard to the remainder.

When we consider how frail infant life seems in our own well-guarded nurseries, it is a marvel how these infants, who run or crawl wild in our streets, like the unowned dogs of an eastern city, manage to live at all. No doubt, with regard to a vast number of them, the answer is, that they do not live, but die. The explanation of the mystery, with regard to a very large proportion of those who are actually reared, is to be found, we believe, in the natural kindness towards children even of the most degraded, especially among women. Mr. Greenwood will agree with us in this, for he says, with more force than grammar—

Wonderful as it may seem, it is not in well-to-do quarters that the utterly-

abandoned child finds protection, but in quarters that are decidedly the worst-to-do, and that, unfortunately, in every possible respect, than any within the city's limits. The tender consideration of poverty for its kind is a phase of humanity that might be studied both with instruction and profit by those who through their gold-rimmed spectacles regard deprivation from meat and clothes, and the other good things of this world, as involving a corresponding deficiency of virtue and generosity. They have grown so accustomed to associate cherubs with chubbiness, and chubbiness with high respectability and rich gravies, that they would, if such a thing were possible, scarcely be seen conversing with an angel of bony and vulgar type. Nevertheless, it is an undoubted fact, that for one child taken from the streets in the highly-respectable West-end, and privately housed and taken care of, there might be shown fifty who have found open door and lasting entertainment in the most poverty-stricken haunts of London. In haunts of vice too, in hideous localities inhabited solely by loose women and thieves. Bad as these people are, they will not deny a hungry child. It is curious the extent to which this lingering of nature's better part remains with these "bad women." Love for little children in these poor creatures seems unconquerable. As every one can attest, whose duty it has been to explore even the most notorious sinks of vice and criminality, it is quite common to meet with pretty little children, mere infants of three or four years old, who are the pets and toys of the inhabitants, especially of the women. The frequent answer to the inquiry, "Who does the child belong to?" is, "Oh, he's anybody's child," which sometimes means that it is the offspring of one of the fraternity who has died or is now in prison, but more often, that he is "a stray," who is fed and harboured there simply because nobody owns him (p. 41).

We are glad to see the opinion we long ago formed on this subject, confirmed by one who knows our most degraded classes so well. However, he suggests another explanation.

They draw a considerable amount of their sustenance from the markets. And really it seems that by some miraculous dispensation of Providence, garbage was for their sakes robbed of its poisonous properties, and endowed with virtues such as wholesome food possesses. Did the reader ever see the young market-hunters at such a "feed," say in the month of August or September? It is a spectacle to be witnessed only by early risers, who can get as far as Covent Garden by the time that the wholesale dealing in the open falls slack, which will be about eight o'clock, and it is not to be believed unless it is seen. They will gather about a muck-heap, and gobble up plums, a sweltering mass of decay, and oranges and apples that have quite lost their original shape and colour, with the avidity of ducks and pigs. I speak according to my knowledge, for I have seen them at it. I have seen one of these gaunt, wolfish little children, with his tattered cap full of plums of a sort, one of which I would not have permitted a child of mine to eat for all the money in the Mint, and this at a season when the sanitary authorities, in their desperate alarm at the spread of cholera, had turned bill-stickers, and were begging and imploring the people to abstain from this, that, and the

other, and especially to beware of fruit, unless perfectly sound and ripe. Judging from the earnestness with which this last provision was urged, there must have been cholera enough to have slain a dozen strong men in that little ragamuffin's cap, and yet he munched on till that frowsy receptacle was emptied, finally licking his fingers with a relish. It was not for me forcibly to dispossess the boy of a prize which made him the envy of his plumless companions, but I spoke to the market beadle about it, asking him if it would not be possible, knowing the propensities of these poor little wretches, so to dispose of the poisonous offal that they could not get at it. But he replied, that it was nothing to do with him what they ate so long as they kept "their hands from picking and stealing." Furthermore, he politely intimated, that "unless I had nothing better to do," there was no call for me to trouble myself about the "little warmint" whom nothing would hurt. He confided to me his private belief that they "were made inside something after the orsestrech, and that farriers' nails would not come amiss to 'em, if only they could get 'em down." However . . . . that real danger is incurred by allowing [fruit offal] to be consumed as it is now, there cannot be a question. Perhaps it is too much to assume that the poor little beings whom hunger prompts to feed off garbage, do so with impunity. It is not improbable that in many cases they slink home to die in their holes, like poisoned rats. That they are never missed in the market is no proof of the contrary. Their identification is next to impossible, for they are as like each other as apples in a sieve, or peas in one pod. Moreover, to tell their number is out of the question. It is as incomprehensible as is their nature. They swarm as bees do, and arduous indeed would be the task of the individual who undertook to reckon up the small fry of a single alley of the hundreds that abound in Squalor's regions. They are of as small account in public estimation as stray street curs, and, like them, it is only when they evince a propensity for barking and biting that their existence is recognized. Should death, to-morrow morning, make a clean sweep of the unsightly little scavengers who grovel for a meal amongst the market heaps of offal, next day would see the said heaps just as industriously surrounded (p. 10).

We have indulged ourselves in this long extract as a fair specimen, both of the author's style and of the cordial sympathy which he feels and expresses for the classes who are too generally either wholly overlooked, or regarded merely as nuisances to be got rid of. This generous tone runs through his volume; when he is speaking of "professional thieves" and "fallen women" as well as of "neglected children." To return to the children, however; it is impossible to exaggerate the sense of blank misery with which his picture fills us. That multitudes come to a premature death is really the most consolatory fact connected with them. The fault of the book is a defect of order and arrangement, which makes it doubly difficult to think of any remedy for the social condition he unveils, because, while you are thinking of one part of the subject, you find yourself unexpectedly in another. But this defect is small compared with its many merits. We must add, what is not a

defect so much as a testimony to the monstrous and complicated evils of the existing state of things, that he hardly anywhere suggests a remedy, and that the few suggestions of the sort which he does make are lamentably out of proportion to the evils he describes. As far as we remember, his only practical suggestions are, that the "rookeries," where so many of the lower classes of London poor are accumulated, should be pulled down, and that emigration on a large scale should be encouraged. Both excellent in their way, no doubt; but if both were fully carried out, one can hardly imagine that any perceptible diminution would be effected in the huge, sweltering mass of sin and misery.

We have touching descriptions of poverty. For instance, he visits a family of six, occupying, night and day, one small room, three children of which had been wholly and absolutely without clothes for three months, and "so hideously dirty that every rib bone in their poor, wasted bodies showed plain, and in colour like mahogany"; in another the baby had for a cradle a gooseberry-sieve, "with a wisp of hay to lie on"; and when he entered, the elder boy was undergoing vigorous discipline for allowing the donkey to eat the "darlint clane out o' bed." These ludicrous scenes are really the only relief of the gloom which covers the whole.

The second chapter gives a miserable account of the "mothers" of these "neglected children." Mr. Greenwood believes that the evil originates, in great measure, because, in modern society, men who would formerly have been content to work for wages, must needs set up as masters, and "live by scheming the labour of others, that is, of little children—any one." "When their 'hands' cease to be children, these enterprising tradesmen no longer require their services, they are despatched to make room for a new batch of small toilers, eager to engage themselves on terms which the others have learned to despise, while these last unfortunates are cast adrift to win their bread—somehow." He adds that any one who posts himself, "between the hours of twelve and two, at the foot of London or Blackfriars Bridge," will see "the young girl of the slop-shop or the city 'warehouse,' hurrying homeward, on the chance of finding a meagre makeshift, 'something hot,' that may serve as a dinner."

Haggard, weary-eyed infants, who never could have been babies, little slips of things, whose heads are scarcely above the belt of the burly policeman, lounging out his hours of duty on the bridge, but who show a brow on which, in lines indelible, are scored the dreary account of the world's hard dealings with them. Painfully puckered mouths have these, and an air of such sad, sage experience, that one might fancy, not that these were young people, who would one day grow to be old women, but rather that, by some inversion of the natural order of things, they had once been old and were growing young again; that they had been seventy at least, but had doubled

the brow of the hill of age instead of crossing it, and retraced their steps, until they arrived back again at thirteen, the old, old heads planted on the young shoulders revealing the "secret." This, the most melancholy type of the grown-up, neglected infant, is, however, by no means the most painful of those that come trooping past in such a mighty hurry (p. 16).

Then follow the different classes of these poor children, for they are little more; some "dogged and sullen-looking," some ailing and sickly-looking, some "flashy and flaunting"; which last, if properly trained, would "grow to be clever, capable women, women of spirit and courage and shrewd discernment"; but who are "the curse and bane of workrooms, crowded with juvenile stickers or pasters or workers in flowers or beads." These, however, are not, according to our author, the neglected children; they are their mothers. Whatever has been said to the contrary, the estate of matrimony among this class is not lightly esteemed; one indication of this is the custom of hanging up the "marriage lines" under the clock, which is said to be "lucky." But marriage is not common, on account of the expense.

Chapter III., one of the most depressing of all, is on "Baby-Farming." It seems to be a regular trade in London, and Mr. Greenwood declares that there is a class of newspapers in which the baby-farmers constantly advertise. "As I write, one of these newspapers lies before me. It is a daily paper, and its circulation, an extensive one, is essentially among the working class, especially among working girls and women." This is shown by the style of its advertisements. "Column after column tells of the wants of servants and masters. "Cap hands," "feather hands," "artificial flower hands," "chenille hands," "hands for the manufacture of chignons and hair-nets, and bead work, and all manner of plaiting, and quilting, and gauffering in ribbon and net and muslin"; and mixed with these are the advertisements by which "the baby-farmer fishes wholesale for customers." Of these specimens are given. Children are taken to nurse for a few pence a day, or they are "adopted," to be fed, clothed, educated, and nursed in sickness and health for from twelve to fifteen pounds. The children we may hope, as a general rule, are speedily released by death. Mr. Greenwood believes "a large proportion of the young 'human Pariahs that haunt London streets were children abandoned and left to their fate by mock adopters.'" Mothers are tempted, by flattering promises for the children, and by the hope of escaping absolute ruin, to have recourse to them, and often pay more than they can afford; but the happiest of the children are those which are practically murdered out of hand. Mr. Greenwood gives a curious account of his answering one of the advertisements himself, and afterwards visiting the place, where he found a "pipe-smoking, beer-swigging, unshaven, dirty, lazy ruffian, nursing a poor little

creature less than a year old, as I should judge, with its small, pinched face reposing against his ragged waistcoat." "It would appear too much like 'piling up the agony' did I attempt to describe that baby's face. It was that of an infant that had cried itself to sleep, and to whom pain was so familiar that it invaded its dreams, causing its mites of features to twitch and quiver, so that it would have been a mercy to wake it." We have no room for the details of the visit to this wretched haunt.

The fourth chapter passes from infants to working boys, their "drudgery and privations, their temptations," &c. In every poor London district there is a "penny gaff," an illegal theatre expressly for children. The plays appeal to the most natural taste of young people, the taste for adventure, and enlist it on the side of vice, for the heroes are thieves, the heroines prostitutes. The author gives a graphic account of the details of a visit to one of these hideous dens, for which we must refer to his volume.

We now follow him to the second curse, "Professional Thieves." "Statistics," he says, "show that one person in a hundred and fifty among us is a forger, a housebreaker, a pickpocket, a shoplifter, a receiver of stolen goods, or what not, a human bird of prey, in short." "No life," he adds, "is more miserable than this."

"Anybody would think, to hear 'em talk," a thief once remarked to me, "that it was all sugar with us while we were free, and that our sufferings did not begin till we were caught and 'put away.' Them that think so know nothing about it. Take a case now, of a man who is for getting his living 'on the cross,' and who has got a 'kid' or two, and their mother at home. I don't say that it is my case, but you can take it so if you like. *She* isn't a thief. Ask her what she knows about me, and she'll tell you that, worse luck, I've got in co. with some bad 'uns, and she wishes I hadn't. She wishes I hadn't, p'raps, not out of any sort of Goody Twoshoes feeling, but because she loves me. That's the name of it; we haint got any other name for the feelin'; and she can't bear to think that I may any hour be dragged off, for six months or a year, p'raps. And them's my feelings, too, and no mistake, day after day, and Sundays as well as week days. She isn't fonder of me than I am of her, I'll go bail for that; and as for the kids, the girl especially, why I'd skid a waggon wheel with my body, rather than her precious skin should be grazed. Well, take my word for it, I never go out in the morning, and the young 'un sez 'good bye,' but what I think, 'good bye—yes! p'raps it's good bye for a longer spell than you're dreaming about, you poor little shaver.' And when I get out into the street, how long am I safe? Why, only for the straight length of that street, as far as I can see the coast clear. I may find a stopper at any turning or at any corner. And when you *do* feel a hand on your collar! I've often wondered what must be a chap's feelings when the white cap is pulled over his peepers, and old Calcraft is pawing about his throat, to get the rope right. It must be a sight worse than the *other* feeling, you'll say. Well, if it is, I wonder how long the chap manages to hold up till he's let go!" (p. 90.)

This, the writer says, was really said to himself, "not by an incarcerated rogue, plying 'gammon,' as the incarcerated rogue loves to ply it," but by "a thief in possession of liberty." He adds: "I never saw the adage, 'suspicion always haunts the guilty mind,' so painfully illustrated as in the thieves' quarter, by the faces of grey-haired criminals, whose hearts had been worn into hardness by the dishonouring chains of transportation."

He paints with great force the extreme difficulty of the position of a convicted thief on leaving prison; the almost impossibility of his recovering himself, however hearty may be his wish to do so. He believes that one main obstacle to his recovery is that "they have no faith in the sincerity, honesty, or goodness of human nature"; "they believe people in general to be no better than themselves, and that most people will do a wrong thing if it serves their purpose." He protests against the proposal that they should be branded before leaving prison, and that the mark should be taken as proof of a former conviction. He wholly, and we think on good grounds, throws overboard Lord Shaftesbury's account of the amount of gain made by thieves. In discussing this he goes back to a subject which would have come more naturally under his first head—the juvenile thieves, many of them brought up by their fathers to the trade. He rather weakens this part of his subject, in our opinion, by bringing in, in the middle of his discussion of it, the subject of dishonest traders, adulterators of food, &c. That many of these are quite as bad as professional thieves, perhaps worse, and with much less excuse, we are very sure. But the nature of their temptations, their actual position before the law, and the means which may be used to stop the evil, are so wholly different, that by mixing them together he makes it, we think, more difficult for his readers to consider what practical method can be adopted to lessen the number of "professional thieves" in London. Two very important practical remarks he does make; the first is, that expense is no real reason against adopting any method which really promises to succeed, because the present system of leaving the professional thieves to prey upon society when they are at liberty, and from time to time seizing, trying, and imprisoning them, really costs more in mere money than any plan which can be adopted to meet the evil. The other is Lord Romilly's suggestion (how far our author supports it we are not sure), that the children of professional thieves should be taken from them for education.

One most important subject, which he places in quite a new light, is that our laws, as at present administered, tolerate the existence of a whole literature, the almost avowed object of which is to inspire boys and girls with the desire to become thieves. A year ago, he says, he "fished in one day, out of one little newsvendor's shop situated in the nice convenient neighbourhood of Clerkenwell, which, more than any other quarter of the metropolis,

is crowded with working children of both sexes, *twenty-three* samples of this gallows literature, all 'thrilling romances addressed to boys, and circulated entirely among them—and girls.'" The articles before him contained "The Skeleton Band," "Tyburn Dick," "The Black Knight of the Road," "Dick Turpin," "The Boy Burglar," and "Starlight Sall." He adds:—"It is altogether a mistake, however, to suppose that the poison-publisher's main element of success consists in his glorification of robbers and cutthroats. To be sure he can by no means afford to dispense with the ingredients mentioned in the concoction of his vile brew, but his first and foremost reliance is on lewdness. Everything is subservient to this." The author goes on to show this as far as can be done without tainting his book, which he avoids with laudable care. And he concludes by asking what security any man can have that such papers may not come into the hands even of his own children, considering that "at least a quarter of a million of these penny numbers are sold weekly," and that even "in quiet, suburban neighbourhoods, far removed from the stews of London and the pernicious atmosphere they engender; in serene and peaceful semi-country towns, where genteel boarding-schools flourish, there may almost invariably be found some small shopkeeper, who" weekly circulates them to "well-dressed little customers."

We have no space to enlarge upon the remaining "curses," as we have on the two first. They are "Professional Beggars," "Fallen Women," "Drunkenness," "Betting Gamblers," and the "Waste of Charity." The passages we had marked under these heads are no less important than those we have already quoted, but for them we must refer our readers to the book itself. To one point only we must call attention. He says:—"Whatever differences of opinion may arise as to the extent and evil operation of the other curses that affect the city of London in common with other great cities, no sane man will contest the fact, that drunkenness has wrought more mischief than all other social evils put together." This statement, of course, we are accustomed to see everywhere. But our author calls special attention to the fact, that "for one victim to alcohol, two might be reckoned who have 'come to their death-bed' through the various poisons which it is the publican's custom to mix with his liquors to give them a fictitious strength and fire"; and then follow some pages devoted to a mere list of the poisons which our poorer fellow-subjects are daily consuming under the name of beer. We are sure that this subject deserves much more attention than it has yet received, not merely as a financial or sanitary question, nor merely as a fraud which ought to be punished, but even more as one which causes extensive moral evil. Why is it, that the working classes of England are so much more in danger of getting drunk upon beer than those of France, Italy, Spain, &c., upon wine? Drunkenness, no doubt, is the special

temptation of northern countries. Let that fact, however, account for the mischief wrought by gin. Beer is not, any more than wine, to be classed with ardent spirits. Yet the effects of beer in England are confessedly far worse than those of wine in France. We believe the real explanation of this to be its adulteration. It is by drinking, at first in moderation, adulterated beer, that the habit of intoxication becomes a slavery, by which men are afterwards led into the abuse of gin. There are at this moment thousands of habitual drunkards around us, who would never have been drunkards if they had not been betrayed into the snare by drinking, in moderation, adulterated beer—that is, if the beer sold in public-houses were not adulterated. We insist upon this, because it is an evil which the law might uproot; and to allow the continuance of which is to suffer a pit to be dug, and then artfully covered over, in the very path of our labouring classes. That a very large proportion of the drunkenness of England is to be attributed to this cause is proved, we think, by the fact that in Germany, where the climate tempts at least as strongly to this vice as it does here, it is by no means so common, one chief difference between the two countries being that the common drink of the working classes there is a weak, unadulterated beer. This evil at least, law, well administered, might meet. At this moment the great diminution of the number of beer-houses which we trust Mr. Gladstone's Government will make, can hardly be opposed except on the ground of vested interests. Why, at least, should it not be enacted, as the penalty on conviction for selling adulterated beer, that the keeper of the house should be disqualified to hold a license, and the house itself disqualified from being licensed? No man certainly can have acquired a vested interest in any right to cheat or poison his neighbours, else nothing could be more unjust than our "Habitual Criminals Act," the very idea of which is to prevent the commission of theft by men who have, by long custom, acquired a "vested interest" in it. Under such a law as we suggest, it would be to the interest of the owners of these houses (very generally brewers) to see that their tenants did not poison their customers. And, considering the advanced state of chemical science among us, it is absurd to suppose that if the Government was determined that so it should be, the selling of adulterated beer might easily be made so dangerous a trade as to be very soon given over. We believe that no one measure would do more to lessen the national curse of drunkenness.

But, alas! although details like this are not to be neglected, how little, after all, can legislation do towards the removal of these "seven curses"! Here it is that Mr. Greenwood's book is disappointing. It is like the roll of the Prophet, written within and without; full of "lamentation and mourning and woe." We do not see how any decent person can read it without feeling ashamed

of his own daily comforts and pleasures, when he considers the lot of so many thousands of his countrymen—"his own flesh and blood" (as Mr. Gladstone said), and when it is brought home to him (as it is by Mr. Greenwood), that these outcasts of society are so far from being unmixedly evil, that, degraded as they are, there are still in them many, very many, redeeming qualities; and still more, that most of them seem not so much to have chosen evil as to have been thrown, by the conditions of our social system, into temptations and disadvantages so great, that he can hardly flatter himself, that, in their place, he would have been better than they.—Can he be certain he would not have been worse?

But the question which forces itself upon every man thus put to shame, is, How may such a social system be cured? and this immediately suggests another, How did it arise?

It is the natural result of the accumulation of a vast population within a small space; and this, again, is a necessary effect of a rich and complicated state of society. Extreme poverty and gross ignorance no doubt very greatly tend to promote it; and wise legislation will, as far as possible, limit and counteract them. But no legislation, however wisely framed upon the most certain principles of political economy, will do more than alleviate the curses of our social system. To alleviate them as far as may be is no doubt a duty incumbent (in proportion to their opportunities) on all whom the Providence of God has invested with any political power. But we must make up our minds to the fact that no past legislation could have prevented, and no future legislation can cure the existing evil. Even if, in time we should succeed in preventing the existence of gross ignorance, it is certain that poverty at least will always exist. Neither are poverty and ignorance its causes. It has its root in the first principles of human nature, which are not changed by education and comparative well-being, although these tend to limit their exercise. It is also worth consideration that these principles have more free action in a state of society like ours, in which all classes enjoy personal freedom, than under that of the civilized nations of antiquity, in which the legislator and the moralist concerned himself only with the free citizens, the minority of the whole, while the mass of the working classes, being slaves, were under the strict discipline of their respective owners. Considering these things, we cannot doubt that the natural tendency of a high and complicated civilization like ours is to produce a large class, which is, on the whole, the worse, not the better, for it; and that, although wise government may lessen the evil, it cannot cure it.

Must we conclude, then, that nothing more can be effected than some alleviation, greater or less, of the existing evil? Assuredly not. All professed Christians acknowledge the existence and operation in the world of two great classes of principles, the natural and the supernatural. Political economy, intellectual development and

the like, deal only with the natural. Experience has proved that they are incompetent to meet the evil. The truly strange thing is, that any one who believes Christianity to be true, however imperfectly he may know it, should have thought it possible that they should. Is it likely, *à priori*, that Almighty God should have provided, at so great a cost, the vast machinery of supernatural graces and motives, if, after all, natural principles by themselves were enough to regulate all the momentous relations of man with his fellows? It is, therefore, only what we must have expected, that any social system which practically trusts only to natural causes and principles, in operating upon the mass of a people, should develop a wholly morbid state of society.—And what we might have inferred experience amply confirms.

If the experience of all ages is sufficient to teach any practical lesson, it is, that the natural tendency of society, if left to itself, and not renewed by any supernatural principle of life, is to advance from a rough and uncultivated state, in which the harsher and more rigid public virtues are developed, to one of more refined civilization, cultivation, and wealth, and as soon as that has been attained to begin to decay, to fall more and more into luxury and self-indulgence, and finally to perish by its own corruptions. In our own day, indeed, from whatever cause, men take for granted the exact contrary to this, that the natural tendency of society is to be always changing for the better. Hence has come into use the very word "progress," which is so commonly employed among us, that one supposes the newspapers must keep it stereotyped to be ready for all occasions. In all former ages of the world men have taken for granted, that the natural tendency of wealth and prosperity to increase is more than counteracted by a tendency of the national morals to become in all prosperous states ever more and more corrupt; and that as civilization and prosperity increase this corruption increases in an ever accelerated proportion, until it leads to an irremediable decay. What the Roman historian considered as the special moral to be derived from the study of Roman history, the ancient moralists, philosophers, and statesmen believed to be the natural, nay, unavoidable fate of every prosperous country. "Ad illa quisque intendat animum; quæ vita, qui mores fuerint per quos viros, quibusque artibus, domi militiæque, et partum et auctum imperium sit. Labente deinde paullulum disciplina, velut desidentes primò mores sequatur animo, deinde ut magis magisque lapsi sint, tum ire cœperint præcipites: donec ad hæc tempora, quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus, perventum est."

And, assuredly, the experience of the ancient world, as far as it went, confirmed the opinion. Prosperity led to indulgence, and indulgence to more insatiable desires, until nations in which poverty and simplicity had originally been held in honour, came

to regard wealth and pleasure as the only things really desirable, or even respectable. It was not that men, as individuals, ceased to believe that self-denial, and a preference for virtue above pleasure, was most beneficial, nay, necessary, for the good of nations; but each man felt that for himself pleasure was preferable to self-sacrifice, and that while the effect which could be produced upon his country by his own individual virtues or vices would be but a drop in the ocean, his individual interests were what really concerned him. Hence men like Sallust, and afterwards Seneca, while never tired of lauding the ancient maxims of the Roman Republic, indulged themselves to the utmost in the accumulation and enjoyment of all modern luxuries. What is most remarkable is that, as far as we are aware, there is no instance of any heathen nation, in which this process of corruption, having once begun, was stayed by any reaction, or return to ancient strictness. Nor is this wonderful; for the voice of conscience, which bore testimony that virtue was higher and nobler than pleasure, was easily silenced, and when men once came to deliberate and reason which of the two they should choose, the cause had already been gained for that side which could appeal to their senses, against that which had for its support only their instinctive feelings. Apparently, therefore, the ancients were not mistaken in believing it to be a general rule of society, that as the means of gratification increased, the desire for pleasure increased with it at a continually accelerated rate, and that the decay of morals and manners more than counterbalanced the advancement in wealth and prosperity.

For ourselves, however, we must profess a strong confidence that this method of reasoning does not apply to modern, that is, to Christian civilization. The tendency of increasing wealth to generate self-indulgence and corruption, is no doubt as strong as ever, but it has against it, not a mere instinct, whose voice is easily silenced amid the bustle of business and pleasure, but maxims which have for generations been admitted as first principles by the whole nation, which are taught, as certain indisputable fundamental truths, to every child from its very cradle, which are enforced in the sacred books which form the basis of the national morals and religion, and are set before all who pay any attention to their religion, in the life, example, and death, not only of the first teachers of Christianity, but, far more, of Him to Whom they gave witness. All this tends to give an advantage to the good cause when the contest comes on between the corrupting power of wealth and luxury on the one side, and on the other the maxims of contentment with little, self-denial, and the superiority of virtue over wealth, which it was quite impossible it should have in a heathen nation. And all this exists even in a Protestant nation, unless indeed, the tradition of Christianity has quite died out in it. A Catholic nation has, in addition to all these, that which affects the

national mind far more than all, the spectacle before its eyes of great institutions founded upon these maxims, and of multitudes of men and women voluntarily choosing for themselves a method of life, which, if they were not unquestionably true, or were not firmly and practically believed, would be utterly unreasonable and absurd; who, "whether they remain in seclusion, or are sent over the earth, have calm faces, and sweet plaintive voices, and spare frames, and gentle manners, and hearts weaned from the world, and wills subdued; and for their meekness meet with insult, and for their purity with slander, and for their gravity with suspicion, and for their courage with cruelty, yet meet with Christ everywhere—Christ, their all-sufficient everlasting portion, to make up to them, both here and hereafter, all they suffer, all they dare for His Name's sake."* No one who considers how much more men are practically influenced by seeing others manifestly and undeniably acting upon any principles, and risking everything upon their truth, than upon any enforcement of them, however reiterated logical and eloquent, can doubt that the visible example of a whole class of people, voluntarily choosing poverty, self-denial, and the abandonment of their own liberty of will and of family ties, must be a practical answer to the arguments and example of all the worshippers of wealth and pleasure to which no other answer could be compared. The lives of the Saints, which make so large a part of the reading of all Catholic countries, receive their explanation and evidence from these visible examples, and in their turn perpetually set before the people their real meaning and principle.

We reply, then, to the question put a few pages back—whether we must be content to leave these curses of our social system unremoved, but only to a small degree mitigated by wise legislation —that very much may be done towards their removal, if supernatural principles and agencies are really brought to bear upon them. Can we say, that, as yet, this has been so far done in London that we could reasonably expect from them any perceptible result?

We have already shown that we are disposed to give full weight to the real difference which exists between a Protestant population from which the practical sense of the supernatural has not died away, and a heathen land. Many of our countrymen assuredly, and many more of our countrywomen, are not merely in theory, but to a very great extent in practice, directed, controlled, and ruled by the supernatural truths which are brought before them especially in the New Testament. Among a large number of the gentry, the portion of truth taught in the Anglican Communion, with all its corruptions, produces its fruit. How else could so many of its members within the last few years have made enormous

* Newman's Sermons on Subjects of the Day, page 291, edition 1869.

sacrifices to become Catholics? Many no doubt still remain in that house of bondage, some of whom may never, in this world, find their way out of it. Nothing of this do we doubt. But what influence has the Anglican Establishment, what influence could it conceivably have, upon the class which supplies the thieves, beggars, and paupers, the baby-farmers and abandoned women, who form the curses of London? The first condition for coming under its influence is and has always been, respectability; and although one small section within it has lately attempted, among other imitations of the Catholic Church, to do something among the abandoned classes of London, we much doubt whether it has really influenced half a score of them. When we have made all possible allowance for this and for whatever may have been done by Protestant dissenters, we feel that to measure the degree to which any supernatural system has really been brought to bear upon these classes, would greatly resemble the task which our men of science have lately imposed upon themselves—that of measuring the degree of heat supplied to the earth by a fixed star. As to the Catholic Church, it is but yesterday that it has had liberty to act, and although it will never act even for a day without doing something for these classes, yet, in England, its power has hitherto been so much limited by the poverty of the mass of its members, and by the disproportion of the number of its Priests to the work it has to do among poor Catholics alone, that its missionary powers are still very limited.

The simple truth then is, that while millions, including vast multitudes of poor and uneducated persons, have been rapidly attracted to London, no attempt has really been made to bring to bear upon them that supernatural system, in the absence of which the wisest politicians of antiquity felt that corruption and decay were the unavoidable consequences of such accumulations of population, which, by the infinite mercy of God, has since been granted to us, which England, three centuries ago, possessed, and of which, alas! her then rulers unjustly and wickedly deprived not only the men of their own day but their children after them.

Long and deeply-rooted prejudices have already been much shaken by the historical investigations of late years, and by increased knowledge as to the practical working of the Catholic Church and of her institutions. Still, we fear that English people will still find it difficult to imagine how directly and powerfully those institutions would have operated, to prevent the formation of the criminal classes which now endanger society among us. To take a single instance—that of the neglected children for whom Mr. Greenwood pleads so pathetically. Can any man seriously doubt, that, if England had been Catholic, men and women in abundance would have been found to devote themselves to their rescue? It would, no doubt, have needed a vast number of persons

dedicated to educational orders, to gather out of the streets both boys and girls, and many orphanages to adopt and train abandoned children, and others for whom the guardianship of their parents is far worse than none. But yet, numerous as these classes actually are in London, it is certain, that if at this moment the mass of our population were Catholic, vocations would be found sufficient to supply all the labourers of both sexes necessary for their purposes. But, of course, if there had existed, say in A.D. 1600, A.D. 1700, and A.D. 1800, institutions sufficient to absorb and train the juvenile population of these days, that vast multitude of neglected children would never have accumulated, which now presses upon our rates and throngs our streets, preparing for the next generation a criminal population larger even than that which is the bane of our own, to be dealt with, as it may be, a few years hence. Gigantic as are the dimensions which the evil has now attained, it would even now be successfully coped with, even by that portion of our countrymen who take a real interest in religious works, if only, in labouring against it they had the help of those graces, which are given in the Catholic Church, and of the institutions which she everywhere produces. Much more would they have prevented its accumulation, had they been in operation to counteract it, before it had gathered strength and become inveterate. We mention the neglected children first, because it is plain that they are the seed of those poisonous plants which are year by year growing up around and amongst us, with a prolific energy ever more and more dangerous and perplexing; and we repeat it, that if the Catholic Church, instead of being persecuted and excluded, had been allowed free course in England for the last three centuries, this evil would never have grown up, and, even if that had been possible, would even now be speedily remedied.

It is not merely for the children of criminals, for deserted infants, and for those which now infest our streets almost like unowned dogs, that the charitable system of the Church is now needed, it is needed almost as much for the whole of that huge class of pauper children who throng our union workhouses.* It is most important that all who a take an interest in such subjects should understand, that, in a union workhouse, any education worthy of the name is simply impossible. We have many good union schools, but those who most intimately know their working are aware, that the children, whether boys or girls, although well taught in them, scarcely leave the union before they return to it; the girls, in most cases, to be confined, the boys as unfit for any other station in life. The Catholic Church would soon provide places of education which would fit them for the work which lies before them.

* Mr. Greenwood states the number of pauper children at 350,000, but does not distinguish those in the union workhouses.

We are not speaking theoretically, we are stating only what experiment has already proved. A few years ago a young priest opened some schools, in one of the most hopeless districts of London, in the poorest and most neglected of the courts and alleys near Drury Lane. The children whom he gathered from the streets were the poorest, the most absolutely neglected of that neighbourhood. He obtained the assistance of some religious, and devoted himself wholly to the work. The children were not sent away to some rural district; many of them in a few years went out into the streets to pursue small trades, such as selling oranges, watercresses, &c. But he had convincing proofs that even in the midst of the temptations of such a calling, many were carefully preserving their purity and honesty. As vacancies occurred in the schools, fresh children pressed into them. The founder complained to the sisters that the school was changing its character. It had been intended for the poorest and most neglected classes, but now well-dressed decent children were taking their places. In reply, the sisters asked what was to be done, for these tidy children, who looked so well off, were of the same families, the brothers and sisters of those neglected ones whom the schools had gathered when they were first opened. Their different appearance was only the effect of the change in the habits of the whole family, which had already been wrought by the attendance at the school of the elder children. This institution, which consists of several distinct branches, schools for boys, for girls, for infants; and working classes in which young women make artificial flowers, &c., is still in full operation, although in other hands, for its founder was early called to his rest. Can we doubt, that if the self-devoting zeal and activity, which are no less characteristic of the English nation than its great wealth, had been brought to bear upon the work of Christianizing London, by means of the spiritual agencies which were brought to bear in this one instance, London would have been preserved from ever falling into the condition which Mr. Greenwood describes. What then would have been the effect if in every part of London there had been, not merely schools like this, founded and directed by the energy of a single priest, with the assistance merely of three or four nuns, but vast communities devoted wholly to the service of God, and of their neighbour, and who, by their own voluntary poverty would have raised the lot and refined the hearts of the poor? Mr. Greenwood, more than once, mentions it as the most hopeless symptom of the criminal classes, that they are wholly without belief in goodness, and almost incapable of being convinced that it exists. They believe that no one, however apparently virtuous and honest, is really any better than themselves; and the first difficulty to be overcome, by any one who attempts to benefit them, is to persuade them that he has not some sinister personal object in view. This

is a depth of degradation unknown in countries where the Catholic Church and her institutions have had free action. The poor find no difficulty in believing that those who profess to be their friends mean what they say, if they see that these very persons might, if they would, have enjoyed all that the world could give, but that they have voluntarily abandoned it all, in order to become sisters of charity or Christian brothers, or monks or friars. The very sight of communities such as these renews, even among the outcasts of society, the effect produced among men, by the mission and sufferings of "Him Who being rich for their sake became poor." Unreasonable as it may be thought, experience proves, that the same confidence is not inspired into the poorer classes by the sight of an Anglican Rector, however exemplary, living, with his affectionate wife and blooming well-dressed children, in some healthy open Square, and who is probably to be found at the sea-side in the hot season, when "there is nobody in London."

This is but one illustration out of many, of the unquestionable fact, that if the Catholic Church and its institutions had been in possession of London during the last three centuries, the lamentable social condition which Mr. Greenwood so feelingly describes, could never have arisen among us. Much as we are tempted to do so, our limits forbid us to follow the subject into its details. One of these, however, we must beg our readers to consider. Among the most hopeless evils of the poor of London must be reckoned the miserable crowding of their habitations. It is not merely that a family, father, mother, and three or four children, are often lodged in one room; we have known cases in which one small room has been the sole dwelling-place of not less than four families. This evil, legislation has of late attempted to meet, and we trust that it is to a certain degree alleviated; yet, do what we may, it is certain that as long as extreme poverty exists, very many families must of necessity be crowded into most limited space. It is difficult to realize to ourselves the condition of a man at work all day in a shop or factory, or of a woman compelled to sit more than twelve hours out of the four-and-twenty, in a crowded work-room, and whose "home" is of this sort. It is certainly much under the mark to say, that there must be, in London, very many thousands of both sexes who, from the cradle to the grave, never know what it is to be for one moment alone. And yet, not to mention anything less sacred, no one surely will hesitate to place solitude and silence among the most indispensable conditions even of a low degree of the spiritual life. And now, by way of contrast, think for a moment, what must have been the condition of a working-man in London before the change of religion. The churches, as we all know, were so numerous that several hundred were crowded together in a space as nearly as possible equal to that of Hyde Park. How many

still remain any one may see, who looks at the City from the river, or from the opposite bank ; and yet, at three several epochs, great and very successful exertions have been made towards a wholesale diminution of their number—first, when all the conventual churches, probably at least half of the churches then existing, were destroyed under Henry VIII ; next, after the Great Fire, when less than half of those burnt down were rebuilt (the sites of the others being turned into those queer little burial-grounds, which we now see from the back windows of City banks and warehouses); and lastly, in our own time, when Bishop Blomfield obtained an act to authorize the demolition of several more, and the transfer of the endowments to support churches in those parts of London which are unprovided with them, because they have grown up since the nation and the government became Protestant. Of course no one can deny that, now and for the last three centuries, they are and have been (as Bishop Blomfield complained) wholly useless. In Catholic times, to say nothing of the great object for which they were built (the offering of that Blessed Sacrifice which makes the church "a heaven upon earth"), each of them was to every jaded, crowd-wearied man, woman, and child, in the highest sense of the word, a home. It was the House of his Father ; whither he could always pass at any moment from the crowd and bustle of city life into the calm, solemn, silent society and converse of his Lord and Master, his Saviour and Redeemer, the light of his eyes, the life of his soul; in which he was always welcome, and always sure to find stillness, order, and peace. Specially valuable in this respect, as in many others, was that "superfluous decking of churches" which the inventors of the new religion instinctively felt to be quite inconsistent with their whole system, and which therefore the Anglican Church has denounced in a special homily, composed and published by authority. This homily vehemently condemns, not merely the use of images "decked with gold and silver, painted with colours, set with stone and pearl, and clothed with silks and precious vestures" (against images of course the superstitious feeling of those days was specially directed) ; but, also apart from this, "the adorning the Temple and House of God, fancying that all people should be more moved with the due reverence of the same, if all corners thereof were glorious, and glistening with gold and precious stones." This is, not inconsistently, condemned, on the ground that the true use of churches is for the preaching of sermons, for public prayers, and administration of the sacraments "at times appointed." It was therefore evidently the deliberate intention of the founders and apostles of the Anglican communion that the churches of London should be used only, as they have actually been used during the last three centuries, for public worship, and should at other times be left empty ; and they felt, very reasonably, that the

"superfluous decking," which they denounce, was useless for this purpose, and might lead to their being used for other purposes. The passage is valuable as the testimony of eye-witnesses, to the state in which these multitudinous churches actually were before the change of religion. Not to mention the first object of all this beauty and gorgeousness—the glory of God and of His House—its value can hardly be over-estimated as a direct means of education to those whose hours of quiet, silence, and calm could be habitually spent only in them. The dwellings of the very poor, especially in a great city, must always be not only crowded, but gloomy and dingy. It has often been remarked that, in some favoured districts, the labouring class gains a very valuable sort of education from living among the great and beautiful works of nature—the sea, mountains, forests, and the like. From such things the poor in a city, such as London, are of necessity cut off. Light, brightness, and cheerfulness, such as it is, they now see, as a general rule, only in gin-palaces or penny theatres, such as Mr. Greenwood describes. When the churches were "decked" in the manner condemned by the Anglican Church (in those homilies which every Anglican clergyman solemnly declares to contain "a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times"), every man, rich and poor, found them almost exclusively in the churches. Private houses were in general less spacious and open than those of our day.

> Privatus illis census erat levis,
> Commune magnum.

But the home of all, upon which so much was lavished, was the House of their common Father. What the gorgeous halls of the Thermæ were to the poor citizen of Rome, whose private dwelling was very small and confined, that the churches seem to have been to the citizen of Catholic London; and thus beauty, brightness, and light, painting and sculpture became associated with his best and holiest thoughts and feelings.

In these days we are wholly unaccustomed to observe the effect of things like this upon the mass of the poor, for they have no access to them; and owing chiefly, we believe, to this fact, it has come to be supposed that the mass of the English people are incapable of appreciating works of art and objects of beauty. This, we are certain, is nothing more than a vulgar error Among all nations, in every rank and every age, such tastes require to be developed by cultivation; and for three centuries, owing to the influence of Puritanism, they have been absolutely and wholly smothered among the English people. As late as the time of George III. Sir Joshua Reynolds found it impossible to persuade Anglican dignitaries that painting and sculpture were not anti-Christian. But that the faculty exists in abundant, perhaps in a

very unusual measure among the English people, is capable of the clearest proof. Without entering on the subject at length, we would mention the development of the arts among the Flemings and Hollanders—the people of Europe nearest to the English in blood and language,—and the marvellous beauty of many works of art produced before the change of religion for English churches and by English artists. To say nothing of architecture, nor again of the ancient decoration of our cathedrals, paintings which fully bear out this estimate are every now and then discovered in some village church, when the whitewash of the Anglican reformers is removed. These things would never have been produced if there had been no demand for them in the national taste, and their educational effect on the people must have been similar to that which Lord Macaulay very truly says must have been produced among the citizens of Athens from "daily walking among the friezes of Phidias and the paintings of Zeuxis."

Surrounded as we are with a vast population of Catholics, the poorest of the poor, we are now almost of necessity compelled to limit ourselves, even in the building of Catholic churches, to the necessary accommodation of our congregations; and hence we have hardly any experience of the effect upon the English poor of churches such as those with which old London was crowded. Yet some idea may be formed by any one who watches the number of persons, many of them belonging to the working class, who come every evening to the church of the Oratory at Brompton, which, while wholly without the least pretensions to architectural beauty, attracts them by brightness, incense, and colour, as well as by musical services and sermons. It is needless to say, in a Catholic Review, that there is Something there far better than all these things, but in former days That was to be found also in every London church. On the whole, we do not think we overstate the matter when we say that even if we did not rely upon the effect of the direct teaching and public worship of the Catholic Church, and upon the power of her institutions, no city which was full of churches adorned and inviting worshippers as those of London once did, could possibly have sunk to the social state in which London now is.

It may perhaps be thought, that to bring the Catholic system to bear upon the mass of the inhabitants of London, would have been difficult, on the ground of costliness, and this the more naturally, because the cost is confessedly one of our greatest difficulties at the present day. But it must be remembered that our present condition is wholly unnatural and exceptional. A very large proportion of the very poorest of the poor are Catholics; while among the wealthier classes, Catholics, much as they have been increased by the conversions of the last thirty years, are hardly more than a sprinkling. In estimating what London would have been but for

the change of the national religion, we have of course supposed the rich as well as the poor to have retained the ancient Faith. But, in truth, even this would not have been necessary in order to provide for the expense of keeping London Christian, if the property voluntarily given by its owners in past times for that express purpose had not been diverted to other uses. Take, for instance (what was, after all, only a fragment of the property devoted in London to the service of the Catholic religion), the portion now held by the Duke of Bedford and by the Protestant dignitaries of S. Paul's. We feel no doubt that this alone would have been abundantly sufficient to maintain religious communities in every part of London, on the largest, most liberal, and most efficient scale, and to have provided churches for the new parts of London. Those parts which were built before the change of religion would have needed none, for they were abundantly supplied.

It seems, then, that for the purpose of keeping London Christian it would not have been necessary that the Catholic Church should have drawn upon the English nation for a single farthing. As far as property was concerned, all that was necessary was, that the nation, acting by its government, should not have applied to other purposes the whole of the property freely given by its owners in Catholic times for that object. To what purposes it actually was applied history informs us, and, indeed, we may partly see it before our eyes. Mr. Hallam, indeed, argues* that, as the "most considerable families within and without the bounds of the peerage will be found, with no great number of exceptions, first to have become conspicuous under the Tudor line of kings, and to have acquired no small portion of their estates from monastic and other ecclesiastical foundations, it is better that those revenues should from age to age have been expended thus," rather than on the objects for which they were given. We do not wish to undervalue the importance of the public services rendered by the Dukes of Bedford. Still it may be questioned whether they have been, on the whole, more important than that of keeping the social condition of London Christian, instead of allowing it to sink into its present condition. On such subjects, probably, men will always differ.†

---

* Constitutional History, chap. ii. We have compressed the quotation.

† It is hardly a digression to observe that Leeds is another of the huge towns which form the difficulty and reproach of our social system. It is built in great measure upon the lands of the abbey of Kirkstall. The lands of this abbey were conveyed, at the time when Cranmer could do pretty much what he liked, "to a relation of his own, one Roger Cranmer." Who owns those lands now we do not know. Strype says that Cranmer also obtained for his own family the tithes of the parish of Aslacton, the place which had the honour to give him birth. We presume this is the same which figures in the "Clergy List" as a vicarage with 359 souls, and £58 endowment, most of which probably has been since derived from Queen Anne's

Our own conclusion then is, that the present social and moral condition of London results from the change of religion in the sixteenth century, and could never have existed if the old religion had been maintained. No thoughtful man, we imagine, will deny its direct tendency to prevent such a state of things. But we shall not be surprised to hear it argued that the curses of London are the necessary result, not of the Protestant Reformation, but of modern civilization, and result from causes which not even the old religion would have availed to counteract, and that accordingly they exist in Catholic as well as Protestant countries. In support of this argument Paris is commonly referred to, and is no doubt the most plausible instance. We have not here space to enter fully into the subject, but we must not wholly pass it by. First, then, it is wholly a mistake to suppose that there are any classes in Paris at all similar to the degraded population of London. It is true there is in Paris a very formidable class. Too many of its working population, though by no means brutalized, and indeed possessing a considerable amount of intellectual development, have learned to reject revelation and to believe that the evils of modern society must be met by a complete social revolution. This class constitute no doubt a real danger to society, but nothing except the blindest prejudices could lead any man to confuse it with that of the neglected children, professional thieves, fallen women and others who are the curse of London. If more degraded, it would be less dangerous, because less powerful. As education is more widely extended among our people, a class like this may become numerous in London ; for it is a most natural result of the system of giving education without religion to men pressed down by the weight of modern civilization. But should it arise, it will be made doubly dangerous by the existence in close contact with it of that other more degraded class which is our present misery. That it has arisen in Paris, so far from being any answer to our argument as to the natural tendency of the Catholic religion, in truth strongly confirms it. For in France the Catholic system has, in very many respects, been swept away ever since 1789, and is now only

---

bounty. It has been common for great prelates to found charities, or in some other way to benefit the place of their birth. We imagine the particular way selected by Cranmer to be without example. It is curious to observe the change of feeling among Protestants with regard to Cranmer and his fellows. A very few years ago, a dignitary, still living—Archdeacon Churton—in his splendid work on the "Yorkshire Abbeys," wrote :—"As it is certain that the leaders of the Reformation are not accused of having enriched themselves, one would rather leave this single act [as to Kirkstall Abbey] under the obscurity in which it rests, than deduce from it any conclusion unfavourable to the personal integrity of Cranmer." It is amusing to compare this tone with that now employed by Protestants upon such subjects.

struggling to regain its influence. Our argument is that it is especially by means of the religious orders that the Catholic religion works upon the poor. But in France the religious orders were swept away eighty years ago. The Count of Montalembert tells us that he himself saw the religious habit for the first time upon the stage. Under such a system how could it or its wearers be known to the working classes of Paris? Again, it is by education that the Catholic Church most directly Christianizes the labouring classes. But, for near a century the French Government has taken education into its own hands, and it is not too much to say that in general it has been wielded with the deliberate intention of excluding Christianity. Even at times when there has been reason to hope that this was not desired by the actual government, the possession enjoyed by the system of irreligious education has been so strong that they have been able to do nothing effectual to counteract it. Lastly, although the Catholic Church, unlike some other societies, does not rely upon money for its working upon the poorer classes, still worldly means are necessary as an instrument in approaching them. But money has for near a century been almost as absolutely wanting to the Church in France as in England itself.

It may be objected that when we refuse to acknowledge France since the Revolution as a fair specimen of the social effects of the Catholic religion, we do not go back far enough; for we may be asked, How is it that the Catholic religion did not avail to render such a revolution impossible? We reply that the government of France, under the old *régime*, had long ceased to be Catholic. No one who has read M. Gérin's work on the Assembly of 1682, and especially the chapter on "Church property under Lewis XIV.," can fail to feel that the whole influence of that absolute government was directed to undermine the religion of the higher classes, both of clergy and laity, and that the endowments of the Church were systematically employed in that godless work. It would be unjust to attribute this personally to the great monarch. His predecessors for more than a century had done even more in the same direction. At last things came to such a pass that the Revolution and the general spoliation of Church property, although producing in their more remote effects vast religious evil among the humbler classes, probably removed more evil than they caused among the higher classes both of laity and clergy. Thus, then, these social curses, so far as they exist in Paris, are the direct result of a falling away from the principles of the Catholic Church, not on the part of the people at large but on the part of the court and the monarch. And, although the evil took a different form, the abandonment of Catholic principles in France and in England is thus far to be traced to the same cause. In both it was caused by the irreligion and vices of absolute rulers

corrupting the court and aristocracy; in both the mass of the people were sufferers rather than doers of evil.

Alas! we must not stop here. It is only too evident, that, not in France alone, but throughout Catholic Europe, the administration of public affairs has long ceased to be Catholic. While, therefore, we see with thankfulness that in those countries the social state both of great cities and of country districts is immeasurably different from that which we have to deplore in England, the conclusion is forced upon us, that there are, and for years past have been, none in which Catholic principles have had free action, or to which we can look with any confidence for their full fruits. Considering the circumstances of Europe, it is only wonderful that the mass of the nation is still Catholic in life as well as conviction in so many countries in which the government is actively hostile. Northern Italy is one case in point. To the future it is not ours to look forward, but bad as things now are, we hopefully expect, that the Providence of God will bring out of the present confusion some new state of things, in which the Church, whose peculiar property it is to adapt herself to every condition of this changing world, will, in spite of all difficulties, find her place and do her work.

But our duties are with the present. And there are things which legislation may even now do. For instance, Mr. Greenwood, in two different parts of his volume, shows that licentious penny newspapers and journals are at present one of the main demoralizing agents. Any Catholic parliament would long ago have put a stop to that curse. In fact, we trust that, Protestant though they be, our present rulers will see the necessity of doing so. We hardly think that any party or any politician of ordinary decency can consider it a necessary part of our highly vaunted "freedom of the press" that men should be allowed to enrich themselves by publishing cheap papers for boys and girls, in which, although nothing is spared "for the glorification of robbers and cut-throats," yet, "the first and foremost reliance is on lewdness." Yet of this literature, our author says, at least a quarter of a million are sold weekly.

We have said that it is only by supernatural agency and motives that the curses of London can really and effectually be removed; that as things now are, no supernatural system is in any degree brought to bear upon the classes which supply the criminal population of London, and that it is by the Catholic Church alone that it can be applied to them. The only reason why the evil has in times past been allowed to grow up and obtain possession as it has, has been, because the Government of England, not content with leaving things alone, both deprived the Church of the property given to her for this very purpose by the piety of her children in times past, and also enforced, for more than two centuries, a code of persecuting

laws, which though they did not prevent her from the secret and concealed exercise of her mission, which hundreds of bloody martyrdoms failed to put down, made all public exercise of it simply impossible. By this means alone it was that things came into their present condition. Liberty has now been restored to her, but she has to overtake the great tide of evil which has accumulated and rushed on with unchecked fury, while the hands of the true Mother were tied, and while she was compelled to look on powerless from a distance upon her children, given over to the power of the enemy. Never before did Satan wage a persecution so successful. The work now to be done is indeed enormous, and the means of attempting it are, humanly speaking, very small. Yet we do not despair, for we cannot bring ourselves to believe that, unless God had purposes of mercy towards our country, so wonderful a resurrection of the Church among us as the last few years have witnessed could possibly have taken place. Let us then "thank God and take courage."

Oh that we had with us the help of all who ought to be on our side! It is sad to think how many of our countrymen, who already see that our country and theirs can be saved only by bringing to bear upon it the principles of the one Catholic Church, continue to delude themselves with the vain hope that they may save it by working those principles in the bosom of a schismatical and heretical communion. What might we not hope to do, if all who desire the revival of Catholic principles of action were only united in the one Church in which alone their existence is possible? It is ours to unite heartily in prayer for the enlightenment of these our deluded brethren, first, no doubt, for their own sake, and then for the sake of our country.

Art. II.—CHRONICLE OF EVESHAM ABBEY.

Chronicon Abbatiæ de Evesham ad annum 1418. Edited by William Dunn Macray, M.A., Chaplain of Magdalene and New Colleges, and Assistant in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. London: Longman. 1863.

THE Master of the Rolls has rendered a very great service to all persons interested in the mediæval history of England, though that service may be, in the form it is given, somewhat incomplete. It is not in his power, even if it be his will, to employ the proper instruments: three hundred years of heresy, with its accompanying ignorance, have collected

a cloud over the ancient records which modern learning cannot disperse; at least that sort of learning which is at the command of the Master of the Rolls. The ability to read an old writing is not the only qualification desirable in an editor; and even the accomplishments of a modern education may prove a snare. But the grave difficulty with which men have to contend is the ignorance of ancient ways, as well as the ignoring of modern practices, which, though they may be unknown to most English scholars, are not unknown to those who pretend to no particular erudition. Thus, by way of illustration, we may instance Mr. Macray himself—a man not inferior to any of his colleagues, and superior to some of them—who says that an indulgence of a hundred days was granted to those who venerated the church of Evesham. If Mr. Macray had been in the habit of gaining, or of trying to gain, indulgences, a practice not uncommon among his countrymen and country-women, even in and around Oxford, he would have doubted the reading of his MS. before he allowed such a statement to appear in print. Not having seen his MS., we cannot tell whether he has read it correctly or not; but we feel some little confidence that, if he has, the scribe made a grave mistake. The indulgence was granted to those who visited the church, not to those who venerated it, whoever they may have been.*

This chronicle of the abbey of Evesham — the abbot was a peer of the realm—for which we are indebted to Mr. Macray, traces the history of the monastery from its foundation in the very beginning of the eighth century down to the beginning of the fifteenth. S. Egwyn, bishop of Worcester, moved by heavenly visions, established monks of the Order of S. Benedict in a waste and barren land, overrun with thorns and briers; but to-day and for many ages gone by, one of the most fruitful portions of fruitful England, the vale of Evesham.

S. Egwyn was bishop of Worcester, and his territorial rule extended over the desolate vale, but he procured from the Sovereign Pontiff a complete exemption from that rule for the rising monastery; the bishop of Worcester gave up the vale and its future inhabitants, and settled them with an independent jurisdiction, for which they were not accountable to anybody but to the Pope. This immunity finds no favour in the eyes of Mr. Macray, who says of it that it "proved so fertile in abuses, and formed at last so strong a link in the chain of causes which drew on the overthrow of the monastic system amongst us."†

* "Concessit omnibus pœnitentibus et hanc ecclesiam venerantibus de pœnitentia sibi injuncta centum dies relexationis." Venerantibus may or may not be in the MS., but the bishop's formula was visitantibus (p. 279).

† Pref. p. i.

Even if it were true that the exemption did all that is here laid to its charge, it is very little to the purpose; because exemptions are privileges which we need not discuss: they have been settled for many centuries by the supreme judge of bishops and abbots, and in this instance of the abbey of Evesham, it was the bishop of Worcester himself who barred his own rights.

In the course of time, as we shall see, the abbey had to fight for its privileges, but it never had to defend their lawfulness or even their expediency: the successors of S. Egwyn in the see of Worcester never disputed the exemptions as lawful in themselves, but they contended that the abbey had either lost them or had never possessed them. Neither does it appear that the ruin of monasteries was ever contemplated as a necessary consequence of independent abbeys. On the whole, bishops and abbots lived in peace; and if the world had not been troubled with other questions than that of exemption from episcopal or diocesan jurisdiction, it is just possible that the abbeys and their inmates might have been visible at this day.

For two hundred and forty years after its foundation the abbey of Evesham observed the rule of S. Benedict, peaceably governed by successive abbots, and in the possession of the endowments which S. Egwyn had given it or procured for it. S. Egwyn himself resigned his bishopric and became the abbot of the church he had founded. On the death of Eadwin, the nineteenth abbot, there was a reformer in the neighbourhood ready to do his work. He had his notions about divine service, and his theories about property, just as if he had been born six hundred years later. He was a great nobleman of Mercia, perhaps the subregulus, Alchelm by name. By some means or other he obtained a grant of the abbey from king Edmund, not the saint, as the chronicler is careful to tell us, and treated it as his property. The issue was that the monks were driven out, and secular canons introduced, who, as usual on occasions of this kind—and they were many in those days—accepted the abbey with diminished revenues: for the change was in the nature of a reform. These canons were expelled afterwards by S. Dunstan and S. Ethelwold, who restored the monks to their lawful home; the possessions of the abbey were also recovered, either from the chief robber himself or from his heirs and assigns.

After the death of king Edgar, who had in all matters relating to the religious houses cordially assisted S. Dunstan and S. Ethelwold, Elferus, earl of Mercia, seized upon the abbey, expelled the monks, and in their place substituted a few canons. He too was a reformer: he gave the lands of the abbey to his soldiers, and paid the priests who served the desolated

churches what he pleased. This nobleman, after a life of rapine, was seized with remorse when he came to die, and by way of restitution, gave the abbey to the monk Freodegar, who, when he went to take possession of the gift, was resisted by the canons and finally driven away. In this perplexity he made an exchange with one Godwin, lord of Towcester, who secured his bargain by obtaining a confirmation of it from Ethelred the king. The abbey and its possessions were now in the hands of men who cared nothing for the rule of S. Benedict, and the monks were excluded from it, to all appearances, for ever. In the beginning, however, of the eleventh century, king Ethelred sent a monk from Ramsey to the abbey, Aelfward by name, who, being a man of great resolution, rescued the church out of the hands of Godwin, and not only recovered most of its possessions, but re-established its exemption, which it had practically lost, from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Worcester, who had been himself, in an irregular way, one of the temporary owners of the plundered abbey. The powerful lords of Mercia were not the only persons whom the monks were in fear of in the matter of their lands: for those of a lower order in the state knew the value of broad acres as well as the great barons; and more than once did such people lay claim to fields and meadows, and go to law with the unhappy monks. One of these men living close by the abbey—*rusticus, et moribus agrestis*—entered upon the domains of the community, and held possession by violence, of the land he had stolen; he persisted in his purpose, and by dint of hard swearing carried on the process against the monks so far as to leave but one act undone previous to a formal sentence in his favour. The judges in the cause appointed a day for this man to appear before them on the land in question, and there to make oath that he believed it to be his own. On the day assigned the prior of Evesham, bearing the relics of S. Egwyn and accompanied by many of the monks, went forth, in sad procession, trusting no longer in human justice, but commending their cause to God and the saint their founder. The countryman also made his appearance, accompanied by a tumultuous rabble, who exulted in the anticipated plunder of the monks. He, too, had made his preparations: for he had covered the inner soles of his shoes with earth taken from land which was undoubtedly his own, and was therefore qualified to swear, when he stood on the lands of the monks, that he claimed the fields, which was true, and that he was standing on his own ground—also true.* He did not live to complete his perjury,

* "Sumpserat de domo sua pulverem, et eo subtalares suos impleverat, ut tuto jurare posset quod supra terram suam consisteret" (p. 43).

for a reaping-hook or scythe, which he held in his hands was so carelessly handled that it struck him on the head. The blow was so violent that it deprived him of life—to the terror of his friends, but to the relief of the abbey, for his iniquitous claim perished with him.

At the Conquest, when so many religious houses, as well as churches, of greater and of less reputation, felt heavily the mailed hand of the rapacious barons, who paid themselves out of the spoils of England, the church of Evesham happily escaped. The abbot Agelwy found favour in the eyes of the Conqueror, and not only protected his own abbey, but afterwards, as one of the judges, procured the restoration of many stolen manors to their rightful owners. It was at the close of the twelfth century that the abbey suffered most; and the story of its wrongs is the chief subject of the Chronicle which is now before us.

By the martyrdom and canonization of S. Thomas, the great monastic church of Canterbury acquired a new title to the reverence of Europe: pilgrims from all nations thronged the roads that led to it, and the monks of Christchurch, guardians of the shrine, became a power in the land. None felt this to be an inconvenience more keenly than Baldwin, the archbishop, who ought to have rejoiced in the splendours of his church, and in the renown it had purchased by the blood of the martyr on whose throne he sat, but of whose spirit he was not the heir. Baldwin had been himself a monk and an abbot, but as bishop of Worcester, and afterwards as archbishop of Canterbury, the only sign of his ancient profession was his oppression of the monks of Christchurch. Confederate with certain bishops who had always thwarted his martyred predecessor, he proposed to build a new church near Canterbury, and to endow it for secular canons. He endeavoured to hide his real intent by dedicating it to S. Stephen and S. Thomas; but the monks were not so simple as to enter the net prepared for them. They resisted the scheme; for it was neither more nor less than their eventual ruin. The archbishop proposed to make all the bishops prebendaries of the church; and even Henry II. himself was to have his stall in the new foundation, and to sing the office, at least by proxy. While the monks were striving to avert the degradation of the great church of Canterbury to the rank of an abbey of the second order, or, rather, of a priory, one of their number, Roger Norreys by name, betrayed the counsel of his brethren to the archbishop, and occasioned them greater trouble. When this was found out, the faithless brother was put in prison, out of which, however, he contrived to make his escape, through the sewers of the monastery, and into the court

of the archbishop. Baldwin received him gladly, and to the great consternation of the monks, sent him back to Christchurch as prior, in October, 1189. There was a tumult in the monastery, and armed men were sent to guard the approaches to it by the primate, who refused even their necessary food to the beleaguered monks whose rights and immunities were so greatly imperilled. There was a great agitation even in the court of king Richard, who had just been crowned; for the proceedings of the archbishop were considered to be too arbitrary even by his advisers. The king went down to Canterbury, where he was received by the convent, November 27th; and on that day and the next a reconciliation took place between the archbishop and the monks of Christchurch, but it was at the expense of the prior, Roger Norreys, whom his friend and patron, the archbishop, remorselessly deposed.

Roger was now a monk let loose on the world; and, as the chronicler of the abbey brands him, as *nullius monasterii monachus.* He belonged to no community, though he had taken vows, and had engaged to observe the rule of S. Benedict. But at this time the abbey of Evesham became vacant, and Baldwin, to his everlasting dishonour, persuaded Richard I. to seize on the patronage of the abbey and to send Roger thither as abbot, against the remonstrances of the monks.* Roger Norreys was now at his ease: having had some experience in the government of refractory monks, he knew how to deal with those who refused to submit to his rule. He was not tried at once at Evesham, for he appears to have lived peaceably with the convent for some years before he broke out and became a public scandal. He was an able man, though neither learned nor good; given to hospitality and a great talker, but destitute of the moral habits befitting his sacred profession. He neglected the rule, as he had always done; absented himself from choir, and wore certain articles of dress not lawful for a monk.

---

* Mr. Macray says that Roger became abbot of Evesham in 1191, and apparently proves the fact by stating that the predecessor of Roger died November 12, 1191. On the other hand, it is to be considered that Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, is severely blamed by Alan, abbot of Tewkesbury, for sending Roger to Evesham; Hoveden (p. 661) confirms this, and yet Baldwin died November 19, 1190, nearly a year before the abbot whom Roger succeeded. In the absence of more correct information, we believe that Roger was made abbot in 1189, or early in 1190. Perhaps the vacancy was occasioned by a resignation. Gervase (col. 1564) says that Roger was blessed by Baldwin; but the date 1191 is clearly wrong, Baldwin being then dead, and is a mistake of the scribe or of the printer, because the year 1189 is followed by 1191. This chronicle favours the earlier date; for, in p. 134, the Papal delegates find that Roger was blessed by William Northall, bishop of Worcester, who died May 3, 1190.

His mode of life, too, was expensive, and his hospitality was probably extended too frequently to the neighbouring barons. He ceased even to see his monks, and treated them, when he came in contact with them, with ostentatious contempt. He abused them by calling them names, and at last made them too intimately acquainted with hunger and thirst. He spent even the revenues of the community upon himself, not satisfied with the revenues of the abbot; and the monks were so poor that they were unable to get their necessary clothing. Many of them could not appear in choir, so shabby had their garments become; while their food was too frequently brought down to bread and water. It was hard to bear, but bear it they did, however, though they longed to feed on what the abbot gave to his servants; and yet there was none to give them even what the meanest of his servants rejected.

In this strait the monks petitioned the archbishop of Canterbury, Hubert Walter, as legate of the Holy See and protector of the abbey. The legate heard their complaints, and gave them relief; but, on the expiration of the archbishop's legatine powers, Roger returned to his ancient ways, and famine reigned in the abbey once more. The abbot gave grand dinners to the Chief Justice of the kingdom, and entertained the barons with lavish hospitality; but the poor monks had not even the satisfaction of eating the crumbs that fell from the abbot's table, though they were the principal contributors to the cost of that display. But all this time they were not asleep; they were watching Roger, tracking his path, and spying out his secret enormities. For this some of them were expelled the monastery, others were imprisoned; but after all, says the chronicler, "we always, by the help of God, came out of his hands alive, though it may be said that some of us died for want of necessary food."

They appealed again to the archbishop, who came down to Evesham, but to no great purpose, for the monks failed, for want of sufficient resolution, to make good their case. The abbot, by himself, or by his friends, prevailed upon some of the brethren to relax in their efforts, and the result was, as usual, that a divided house cannot stand. The archbishop returned, the abbot kept his place, and the poor monks were reduced to greater straits than they had ever been in before. The abbot, without learning or even decency, succeeded in his cause, because he knew his own mind, and was able to win over some of the weaker monks, if not to espouse his quarrel, at least not to oppose him, with the necessary firmness.

In this deplorable condition of the monastery Malgerus, bishop of Worcester, compassionating its condition, obtained

from Innocent III. powers to visit all the churches subject to his jurisdiction within the diocese, and to make such corrections therein as should be necessary, from which there should be no appeal. It is plain from the story, and admitted by the chronicler, that the bishop was in good faith; he really believed that the abbey was subject to his authority. He sent word to Evesham that he should arrive on a certain day to make his visitation. When the abbot received this notice, he replied, "He shall be welcome"; for he thought nothing of it, and regarded the bishop's visitation as a visit of common politeness, which he intended to accept and treat as such. But those who were with the abbot saw more in the matter than he did, and began to discuss its real significance. After a time they sent for Thomas of Marlborough, one of the younger monks, learned in the law, and asked him to explain the force of the bishop's words. Thomas, without hesitation, told them that the bishop proposed to visit the abbey as its superior, and ended by saying that the convent must resist or lose its immunities for ever.*

It might be supposed that the monks would be unanimous in their zeal for the rights of their house, and that the visitation by the bishop would meet with universal resistance. But it was far otherwise; many of the more timid, or the more prudent, saw great difficulties in the matter; they feared the expense of a lawsuit, and trembled in anticipation of great privations which they might have to endure if they ventured to resist the episcopal claim. The elders attributed the usual motives to the younger, who, they thought, desired litigation that they might have an excuse for going abroad, where they would be well fed at the expense of the abbey, while those who remained at home perished of want. Some even withdrew

* Thomas of Marlborough is the writer of the history from which we are quoting, and the author of the greater and most interesting portion of this chronicle of the abbey. Mr. Macray has adopted a superstition too common among his fellow-editors, who think they discover original autographs, and would like to believe that he has the MS. which Thomas wrote himself. Mr. Macray's argument would prove that Thomas was not only a skilful scribe, but also a good mason, carpenter, tailor, goldsmith, and glass-stainer, as well as glass manufacturer. He may have been all this, but it is improbable. It might as well be contended that a voluminous marriage settlement, on several skins of parchment, is in the handwriting of the attorney who presents it for the signature of the parties concerned, as that the MS. which Mr. Macray contemplates is in the handwriting of Thomas of Marlborough. If the term "*fecit*" implies that Thomas wrote it, it must also imply that Thomas was a tailor, for he made two albs: *fecit duas albas. Turres presbyterii fecit; fecit thronum feretii, fecit sedes, fecit fenestram vitream de historia S. Egwini* (p. 269). Besides all this, he repaired walls and books, and was a perfect mechanic as well as a scientific architect.

from all share in the struggle, though they were prepared to profit by the issue, if it should be favourable to the menaced community. The younger monks, however, prevailed, and it was finally resolved that the bishop should not be permitted to set foot within the monastery, relying on its exemption from his rule.

The abbot, seeing the resolution of the monks, consented to the plan of resistance, and three of them were sent at once to the bishop to inform him of their purpose. The bishop, persisting in his intention, replied that he should visit the abbey. Roger, now dreading the issue, and caring more for himself than for the abbey he so unworthily governed, offered to receive the bishop, and to submit to him in all matters, provided only he himself should be untouched. He had succeeded in this way with a former bishop who visited the abbey, and observing the compact, had never censured the abbot further than to accept from him a promise never to use the pontifical ornaments which had been conceded to the abbot of Evesham.* Malgerus would make no compromise with the abbot, and on the 23rd of August, 1202, early in the morning, arrived at the gates of the abbey.

But at a still earlier hour every preparation had been made within. The monks had said their office before the usual time, and had closed every door and gate by which the abbey could be entered: only the church was open. The bishop's men and horses were not allowed any shelter, for even the stables were closed. The bishop submitted to the indignity, and entered the church, where, after making his prayer, he proceeded to enter upon his duties. His apparitor summoned the abbot and the monks into his presence, but to no purpose; the abbot had taken to flight about sunrise, and was far on his way to, if he had not already reached, one of his country houses.

At the summons of the bishop twelve monks, however, appeared before him, of whom Thomas of Marlborough was one. Thomas, as the lawyer of the house, spoke for his brethren, thanked the bishop for his good intentions, and civilly declined his jurisdiction. While he was still speaking, the whole community entered the church to say tierce; and Thomas, now triumphant, said to the bishop, "Go away; make haste; the monks are coming in for the service of God."

* Mr. Macray, Index, *voc.* Adam, says that "Evesham appears to have been the first abbey that obtained the use of the mitre for its abbot. The grant is dated 1163." The abbot of S. Augustine, Canterbury, had this privilege a hundred years before the abbot of Evesham, Alexander II. having granted it in 1063. Thorn. ap. Twysden, col. 1785; and Historia Monaster. S. Augustini, ed. Hardwick, p. 27.

"Is this a threat?" asked the bishop. "Certainly," replied Thomas, "for you have come on a foolish errand." The bishop retired, and found his way into the chapter-house, where he summoned the monks once more; and each time the summons was repeated, the same obstinate twelve made their appearance, and formally appealed to the Holy See.

The bishop, thus thwarted, suspended the monks, and prohibited the further celebration of the divine office in the church. Having done this, he took his departure without giving his blessing to the monks, or, indeed, being asked for it. The suspension was regarded as a nullity, because of the appeal, and accordingly the office was sung, and mass was said with greater solemnity, if that were possible, than the abbey had ever witnessed before. This was not all; there were two monks of Worcester in the abbey at the time, where they were entertained, because their own monastery had been lately burnt. Now these two monks were subjects of the bishop, and so the monks of Evesham sent them to their superior the same day, on the ground that he had suspended them that morning, though he had not the remotest intention of doing so.

The next day, the feast of S. Bartholomew, the abbot of Alcester, with divers clerks, came to the abbey—the monks were prepared for the visit—but was refused admittance; and so, standing at the gates of the cemetery—the church he could not enter because of the interdict—pronounced sentence of excommunication, by order of the bishop, against the refractory monks. Notwithstanding this further act of rigour, mass and office were never intermitted in the abbey church.

Thomas was now sent by the monks to inform the abbot, who knew as well as they did what had taken place in the abbey he had cowardly deserted. When the resolute monk reached the hiding-place of "the hireling," he was told that he could not speak to him because he was excommunicated. Thomas, nothing daunted, and probably expecting such treatment, retired to a house belonging to the abbey, where he remained for the night, intending to visit his superior the next day: he had not been importunate because he thought that the abbot might have been drunk. The next morning he fared no better; so he made his way, as he had been directed, to Canterbury; but meeting the archbishop three miles beyond London, he was spared the rest of the journey. He told his story to the primate *cum fletu et ejulatu magno*, and implored his protection against the encroachments of his suffragan, who not only violated the immunities of the abbey, but trenched on the rights of the metropolitan. The archbishop, after swearing by the blessed Julian, requested Thomas to keep his grievances

to himself for the present, and not to make them known to everybody; for he, the archbishop, would not yield in this matter any of the prerogatives of his see. Thomas attended the primate in church, sat by him at table, and when "I had eaten with him," he says. "I was comforted." And well he might be, for it was a sign that the archbishop made no account of the sentence of excommunication pronounced by the bishop.

The archbishop went down to Worcester in September—the occasion of his visit was that he was one of the commission to inquire into the miracles of S. Wolstan—but gave no decision, and adjourned the further hearing to another day, when he should hold his court at Lincoln. The monks were in great joy, for at least the bishop's sentence was of doubtful value even in the primate's eyes; but there was no rest for Thomas. On his return from Worcester, he was again sent after the abbot, who, despairing of corrupting the bishop, had now taken to flight in earnest, and was on his way to Rome disguised as a layman. Thomas found him at Newbury; and after much persuasion, and by impressing upon him the fact that the archbishop had not treated the monks as excommunicate, prevailed upon him to return. Thomas further promised the miserable abbot that, even if the bishop succeeded in the suit, the monks would not desert him, nor ask the bishop to depose him, provided he stood by his brethren in their great fight for the immunities of the abbey. This promise was most religiously kept by the whole community.

Mr. Macray, in his preface, censures the monks for thus consenting "to tolerate vice in a house dedicated to piety," in order to enable them to escape from the yoke of the diocesan jurisdiction. If Mr. Macray will give the reins to his imagination, and picture to himself a college in Oxford, the head of which shall be not even the choice of that college, but imposed upon it from without, a man of extravagant habits, inobservant of the moral law, frequently non-resident, and, when at his lodgings, heedless of the chapel bell; let him add to this that he treats his Fellows with contumelious scorn, never asks them to dinner, and stints their commons in the common hall—if, under these circumstances, the chancellor of the university or the bishop of a diocese were to propose to visit that college, and promise redress of all grievances, we should like to ask Mr. Macray whether he would think it a wise or unwise proceeding on the part of the aggrieved Fellows if they resisted the encroachments of the chancellor or bishop, who has no jurisdiction within the precincts of the college, and invoked, in preference, the authority of the proper visitor. Mr. Macray,

we are persuaded, would think it wrong in the Fellows to sacrifice the independence of their college and, for the sake of escaping from a present evil, which it is true pressed them sore, to accept an unlawful remedy. The monks of Evesham did the same thing; they declined the unlawful visitation of the bishop of Worcester, and appealed from him—when he attempted to do what he ought not to have attempted—to their own visitor, who was no other than the Sovereign Pontiff himself.

The cause of the abbey was pleaded again at Lincoln, and afterwards in London, but the archbishop gave no sentence; and, indeed, if he had it would have been of no value, because at this time the matter had been practically carried to a higher court. Thomas of Marlborough, foreseeing troubles for the abbey, had procured from Rome a special commission for the settlement of those questions which might arise between the bishop and the abbey. The papal delegates were the abbots of Malmesbury, Abingdon, and Ensham; and to these the archbishop remitted the dispute, because it now belonged to them, and not at all to himself. Before these judges the bishop of Worcester and Thomas appeared; but the bishop at last appealed from them, on the ground that he suspected them of partiality. He went at once to Rome to prosecute his appeal in person, and the abbot and the monks sent also their agents; for, notwithstanding the reconciliation, neither trusted the other. The delegates, however, retained the cause notwithstanding the appeal; and, for greater security, the monks continued to attend their court, for fear they might lose anything by negligence.

The abbot, now secure in his place—for he knew that while this important lawsuit about the rights of the monastery lasted no attack would be made upon him,—began to resume his former courses, and the poor monks were reduced to poverty once more. The farms which should have supplied them with food and raiment were let, without their consent, to tenants who paid their rents to the abbot, and not to the officers of the convent, to whom they ought to have been paid. In this difficulty the monks took the law into their own hands—for nobody had compassion on them—and reaped a field which they had not sown, but the freehold of which was undoubtedly theirs. For this they were summoned before the archbishop and the king, whose anger they had incurred by so summary a process. Thomas of Marlborough was sent, on the part of the convent—he had been probably the instigator of the illegal reaping—to propitiate the archbishop and king John. John refused to listen to him, and sent him away with threats and

revilings. Before the primate he was more successful, and was allowed to plead his cause. He maintained that, as the soil belonged to his convent, so also did all that grew on it, because it could not be alienated without the consent of the owners, and that consent had never been given. He added that the monks would be driven to much worse acts if their grievances were not redressed; and he then called upon the primate to exercise his undoubted powers as protector of the abbey, and to stand between them and ruin. The archbishop again swore by S. Julian that he would see justice done, but he did not live long enough to accomplish his good intentions.

Thomas now left the archbishop, and went to Worcester to plead in the matter of that reaping, as defendant in the action brought against the monks by their own abbot and the steward of the abbey, whose corn had been so feloniously cut. Roger, the abbot, now excommunicated Thomas, and set a watch at the gates of Worcester, with directions to seize him and to throw him into prison. Thomas, however, contrived to enter the city, and in due course appeared in court; but the abbot and the steward objected to his being heard, on the ground of the excommunication. The judges admitted the objection, and Roger had him apprehended; but on the way to prison three friends of the poor monk—chaplains of the archbishop, who came that day to Worcester—rescued him out of the hands of his enemies, and took him to the primate. Two chaplains of the abbot now came to the archbishop, and offering him a silver cup and a palfrey, by way of bribe, demanded the custody of Thomas. The archbishop very prudently requested the abbot to keep the presents till he should send for them, but refused at the same time to deliver up the monk, who, on his part, protesting that he had appealed before the sentence was delivered, insisted upon treating it as a nullity. The primate was thus cautious in the matter of the presents because he did not wish to excite the fears of the abbot, and drive him to appeal against his authority before he had pronounced his sentence in the cause between him and the abbey.

Thomas was allowed to return to Evesham, but not without some misgivings, for the archbishop, who does not seem to have had perfect confidence in him, told him, that if he failed to prove his case, his punishment would be heavier than that of the abbot, even should the abbot be found guilty. Thomas returned to the abbey, but all his brethren were not over glad to receive him; for some of them were angry with him because he had told the primate of the excesses of the house. It is probable, therefore, that Roger had friends and accomplices among the monks whom he treated so ill.

The archbishop now proceeded to Evesham, and, having assembled the whole community in the chapter-house, reproved the monks generally for their disorderly lives, and inquired into the matters in dispute. It was not easy for him to arrive at the truth, for the monks said one thing and the abbot another. At last he offered them either to pronounce his decision himself, or to refer the matter to three arbitrators, of whom he was to be one; while the abbot was to have the choice of another, and the monks that of the third. In fear lest the abbot should appeal from the primate before he gave his sentence, Thomas persuaded the monks to adopt the latter of the two alternatives; and as the abbot also consented, because every delay was in his favour, the arbitrators were chosen. Roger elected Clement, abbot of Chertsey, and the monks Eustace, bishop of Ely. The consent of both parties was recorded in a deed, sealed with the convent seal, and guaranteed by the oaths of those concerned. The award of the arbitrators was, on the whole, in favour of the monks, and against the abbot; nevertheless, four of them were sent away—probably to other houses belonging to the abbey, on account of the transgression they had committed in reaping the field they had not sown. While this internal dispute about the letting of this field distracted the monks, they never forgot the great question between them and the bishop of Worcester; and Thomas relates with satisfaction, that the archbishop and other great men regarded them with admiration for their courage; saying of them, they had never seen such monks.* Thomas of Marlborough himself was one of the banished monks; but, as he was the lawyer of the convent, the archbishop permitted him to return after a fortnight's exile. The abbot would probably have preferred a longer, if not a perpetual banishment, because he was afraid that the monks might proceed against him before the arbitrators, and obtain his deposition. The monks had bound themselves not to accuse him before the bishop, but they were at liberty to do so before the primate and the Pope; and, by his own consent, before the arbitrators, though he probably was not aware how much he had yielded when he assented to their appointment. He was now in great fear, and so made his preparations for travelling to Rome, because his appeal to the Pope, even if he failed, would at least delay the expected deprivation.

But by this time the bishop of Worcester had returned from Rome, bringing with him, with the consent of the proctors

* "Archiepiscopus et alii terræ magnates admirati sunt, dicentes, quod nunquam tales monachos viderant" (p. 130).

for the abbey, a commission from the Sovereign Pontiff, directed to the bishop and the prior of Coventry, and to the archdeacon of Northampton. These three were to hear the cause of the abbey and the bishop, but under certain restrictions. They were to ascertain who, in point of fact, possessed the contested jurisdiction at the beginning of the dispute; and, if the bishop proved his claim, they were to give him possession of the jurisdiction: otherwise not. But on the real merits of the case—to which of the two parties, the bishop or the abbey, the jurisdiction rightfully belonged—they were not to give any sentence whatever, but to transmit all evidences and documents to Rome, where the Pope himself would give his decision. This was nothing but the ordinary practice; for, seeing that the bishop alleged that he had been disturbed by the monks in the possession of a right, he could not be required to plead before he was restored to the position he occupied before the commencement of the suit. The duty of the delegates was twofold; to give sentence upon the fact of possession, and to receive evidence as to the right. The proctors of the bishop seem to have neglected this distinction, for they argued the whole question before the delegates, and did not keep their evidences distinct. They saw the mistake they had made only when it became necessary for them to furnish their adversaries with copies of their proofs, called, technically, publication. Thomas of Marlborough knew from the beginning that they were blundering; but, as it was not his duty to help the bishop, he held his peace. When the error was discovered, the bishop's proctors requested the delegates to suppress all that portion of their proofs which related to the question of right; but the monks refused to consent, and insisted upon having copies of the whole, because it was impossible now to keep anything back from their knowledge without manifest wrong to them and their monastery.

The delegates, finding it impossible to separate the evidence into two parts, decreed publication of the whole. Thomas and his friends saw at once that their case was hopeless—Thomas knew it from the very beginning—and that the bishop must recover possession. The rights of the abbey had been so carelessly maintained, and the interference of the bishops of Worcester so frequent, that it could not be doubted that the bishop was actually seized of the jurisdiction when the monks refused to admit him into the abbey, and treated the sentence of excommunication with contempt. In fact, the monks knew that in the matter of possession their case was bad; the bishop was really seized of the jurisdiction he claimed; but they were confident that when the question of right came to be argued in Rome the victory would be theirs.

Under these circumstances there was but one course open to them; they must take the cause to Rome as soon as they could. Roger Norreys himself was of the same mind, though he may not have been influenced by the reasons that prevailed with the monks. The bishop also, taking advantage of the sentence of the delegates,* did what he could to induce the reluctant community to accept it; he treated them with all kindness, and as many of them as he could he invited to dine with him at Fledbury. The politeness of the bishop bore fruit; some of the brethren thought it would be as well for them to be subject to him. Thomas, however, was not to be persuaded; and, in the monastery he impressed upon his brethren the inconveniences of the episcopal rule, and the consequent ruin of the abbey. The more prudent listened to him, and the result was that an immediate recourse was had to Rome. The advice of the more timid brethren was rejected, and the abbey prepared for a determined prosecution of its suit.

Roger Norreys also found it necessary to go to Rome: he feared the bishop, and, above all, his own monks. Besides, he was hampered by his own consent to an arbitration, and was not certain that his deposition might not be the result of any complaints made against him before the arbitrators. This latter fear was well-grounded, for the monks earnestly desired to lay all their complaints before this tribunal, though they would make no accusation against him before the bishop. They were precluded from this by the promise made at Newbury, and by their own refusal to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the bishop. Roger therefore prepared for his journey, and the monks with some difficulty obtained his consent to the appointment of Thomas as proctor for the abbey. Roger, though he assented, would not travel with Thomas; but as it was dangerous to let him go by himself, he made one of his chaplains accompany him, so that he might have some knowledge of his proceedings on the road. These three met together to arrange their affairs before quitting England, and made a solemn promise, confirmed by oath, that they would be true and faithful

---

* Mr. Macray (p. 131, and Preface p. xlvi.) says that the sentence was pronounced April 24, 1205, and (in p. 147) that Thomas left Rome April 18 of the same year; but the sentence had been then reported to the Pope by the bishop: *jam significaverat episcopus Domino Papæ quod pro eo lata fuit sententia in judicio possessorio* (p. 146). The facts seem to be that the sentence was pronounced perhaps before Michaelmas term 1204, but not executed till April 24, 1205. The text is express: *missus est episcopus in plenam possessionem jurisdictionis . . . Dominica quâ cantatur Misericordia Domini* (p. 131), that is, April 24; but it does not say that the sentence was pronounced on that day: it was pronounced some time before, because it was known in Rome even before that day. In a second edition Mr. Macray must alter his marginal notes.

to one another. Thomas says he kept his oath; but the others were of more elastic consciences, and so conducted themselves as to authorize him to charge them with a breach of their oath whenever it proved to be convenient for them to do so.

Thomas with many tears took leave of his brethren, but resolved never to return if he lost his cause. In the event of failure, he made up his mind to spend the rest of his days in a religious house in Rome, because he could never bear to see the abbey he loved shorn of rights which he believed belonged to it. Having received the benediction of his superiors, he left the house with the abbot's chaplain and two servants. They had two horses to carry them, and Thomas showed himself merciful even to his beast, for he used it so well that it carried him to Rome. The abbot's clerk had not been so careful, for he had changed his horse three times. On the fortieth day after leaving Evesham, the travellers entered the Holy City, and Thomas proceeded at once to implore the Pope, Innocent III., to suspend the execution of the sentence pronounced by the delegates, and to determine the whole question himself. The Pope assented to the monk's request, and Thomas in the joy of his heart offered the Pontiff a silver cup of the value of six marks. But the matter was not so easy as he thought, for when he petitioned the Pope to issue the necessary letters for the revocation of the suit to Rome, he found his Holiness not so ready to comply as he expected. It is likely enough that the Pope had doubts about the facts; however that may be, the answer that Thomas got was, "We have heard that your abbot is detained on the road; find out by whom and where, and we will procure his release; when that is done you shall have your letters." Thomas pressed his suit—insisted upon the fact that the bishop's letters were informal, and that the revocation of the cause was due of right. The Pope replied that he had granted the commission with a full knowledge of the facts, and that he would not now recall it. "That is my answer," said the Pope. "Truly," said Thomas, "but it is an act of power." The Pope was patient, and asked him if the answer was not also according to law. Thomas was now insolent, and replied, "I do not know." Upon this the Pope ordered him to hold his peace and withdraw from his presence.

This was at the end of the year 1204, and in January of the following year Thomas and his companion went to Piacenza in quest of their missing abbot; there they heard that he had been imprisoned at Chalons. He was released after a time, and Thomas next heard of him in Lombardy. As it was of some consequence to find him, Thomas and his companion separated in order to prosecute the search, but with an understanding that

whichever of them should first fall in with the abbot should send news of his good fortune to the other. Faith was not kept with Thomas, and the abbot and his chaplain entered Rome, in the first week of Lent, together, without giving him any information. Thomas of Marlborough discovered the fraud, and, on the fifth day after the abbot's entrance, entered also, but in disguise, for he was in some fear of his superior. Some of the abbot's retainers, lounging at the gates of the city, recognized him even in his disguise; but he was not disconcerted, because he had anticipated the British invention of *habeas corpus*, and had given a lawyer in Rome a certain sum of money to procure his release should the dreaded Roger make him a prisoner in his lodgings. Provided against all violence in this way, he now entered the abbot's dwelling, and found him in bed. Thomas addressed him, but received no answer—even to his tender inquiries after his health, and was at last requested by the abbot's servants to withdraw. The next day, attended by his lawyer and others as witnesses, he went again to the abbot's lodgings. He entered alone, leaving his friends in the street, but with instructions to demand him if he did not reappear at the proper time. Thomas saluted the abbot, but was not saluted in return; nevertheless, he persisted in his civilities, and even asked the abbot to lodge him in his house. Roger was very angry, and called him a traitor; but it ended as Thomas desired. For a fortnight the abbot never spoke to him, and on the first day sent him an order never to leave the house, and never to enter the court but in his company. All this time Roger assumed to be a most exemplary monk, solicited powers to correct the excesses of his subjects, and, in particular, to expel two disturbers of his convent's peace, a physician and a lawyer—none others than Thomas of Northwich and Thomas of Marlborough himself, though their names were not mentioned in the brief.

The pleasure of living in the same house with the abbot could not have been very great, but it was useful to Thomas in many ways, for he thereby kept a watch upon the movements of Roger, and did his duty to the abbey he loved so well. Thomas cared nothing for the abbot, it being the firm resolution of himself and his brethren to obtain his expulsion as soon as the lawsuit about the exemption should have been decided against the bishop of Worcester. One of the abbot's chaplains, Henry Coleham, warned Thomas of the danger he incurred, for that Roger had serious designs upon his liberty, if not upon his life. Thomas prepared himself for the event by intrusting what money he had about him to his friend, and furnishing himself with a knife, which he carried about his person, resolved,

apparently, to use it, we are sorry to say, whenever the occasion should arise. Judges and magistrates in these days make many severe remarks upon the un-English usage of the knife, which has become too common in modern times; but there is no period of our history in which that weapon has not been employed. Thomas of Marlborough, though a learned lawyer and a monk, seems to have had no misgivings about it when he thought he could use it to his own advantage and in his own defence.

Notwithstanding the unpleasant relations subsisting between the abbot and his monks, there was no diminution of zeal in prosecuting the claims of the abbey. They obtained a confirmation of all the privileges belonging to it, and Roger more than once appeared in the Papal presence wearing his mitre. But they could not obtain any letters to suspend the effect of the sentence of the delegates, and Roger could not procure his release from the obligation of submitting to the arbitrators. The bishop of Worcester had informed the Pope of the sentence given in his favour by the delegates, and the proctors of the abbey could do nothing more till the bishop or his lawyers came to Rome. The abbot and Thomas, therefore, went to make the customary presents, and for this purpose borrowed 400 marks; but the presents could not be received till the members of the court were certified that Roger and Thomas were neither plaintiffs nor defendants in any cause then before it.

They now left Rome—on the 18th April, 1205,—Roger for England, attended by his creditors, who went to receive their money; Thomas for Bologna, where he waited for further instructions about the lawsuit, but heard attentively the lectures of the professors of canon and civil law. Roger, at Vercelli, met Adam Sortes, one of his monks, who was going to Rome to appeal against the sentence of the delegates; and, as he knew that the whole cause would have to be argued, he told the monk to follow him to England. Adam did so, but with great difficulty, for he had to walk nearly the whole way, and yet he reached the abbey before Roger. At Evesham the monks were in trouble; the bishop had taken formal possession of the contested jurisdiction, and, as soon as Roger returned, summoned that unworthy prelate to submit to the visitation. Roger, now clearly in the wrong, shut the gates of the abbey in the face of the bishop, and was excommunicated for his contumacy. But when he saw that the sentence was respected, and that none would venture to hold any communication with him, he withdrew from Evesham, and left the bishop undisturbed in the peaceful exercise of his rights as visitor. Yet for all this, the bishop, though received with all outward reverence, was still comparatively powerless; for when he held his court, and made

inquiries into the life and conversation of the abbot, not one of the monks, though they longed for the deposition of their superior, would give him the slightest information. The bishop warned them, and threatened even to excommunicate them, if they persisted in their silence. Upon this the monks threw their cowls at the feet of the unwelcome visitor, and said they would quit the abbey till the question between him and them should be finally decided. The bishop was touched, for he was a good man—even the monks who resisted him bore willing testimony to his worth and good faith in his dealings with them —and abstained from further proceedings, to the great satisfaction of Roger, who once more escaped from the justice that was dogging his steps; slowly, it is true, but without halting.

Thomas meanwhile was perfecting himself at Bologna in the science of law—*audiens quotidie leges et canones*—in order to the better pleading of his cause. The delegates in England had appointed the octaves of S. Martin for the appearance of the proctors, both of the bishop and of the abbey, before the Pope. Their report was now in Rome, and there Thomas, who had quitted Bologna at Michaelmas, met the bishop's lawyers, the chief of whom was Robert of Clipston. They were come to defend the bishop in the exercise of that jurisdiction which he claimed over the abbey—admitted by the delegates to belong to him—and to recover for him, if possible, the same jurisdiction over the churches of the Vale of Evesham, but which the delegates found to be vested in the monks.

The Papal delegates had decided that the jurisdiction of the abbey was, in point of fact, vested in the bishop; but they decided also that the churches of the Vale were not subject to him. They had no power to decide the question of law. Both parties to the suit lost and gained, but the loss of the monks was the heavier, for they were condemned to make satisfaction to the bishop for their contumacy. The abbey was to lie under an interdict for three days, and the monks were to submit, in the chapter-house, to the discipline which the bishop should inflict upon every one of them. They were to stand barefoot at the abbey gates, and on bended knees to implore his forgiveness when he should come to take possession; and for three weeks after the removal of the interdict, only thirteen of the monks were to be permitted to say mass in the abbey. From this sentence the monks appealed, and for the purpose of meeting that appeal, as well as for the purpose of setting aside the decree which gave the churches of the Vale to the convent, the proctors of the bishop were now in Rome.

When the report of the delegates, together with the sentence, was brought up before the Pope, Thomas, as the proctor of

Evesham, was called upon to plead. Thomas had not been idle at Bologna, and was perfectly instructed as to the truth of the common saying, that possession is nine points of the law: he therefore said that all the evidences of the abbey had not yet reached him, and he was therefore unable to plead the question so far as it related to the churches of the Vale. It was the fixed resolve of Thomas to put off as long as possible all discussion of that part of the sentence which was favourable to the abbey, for he knew that the longer the abbey held that jurisdiction, the more difficult it would be to take it away. On the other hand, he was ready and eager to plead against the bishop in the matter of the jurisdiction over the abbey, and offered at once to enter upon it. To his great astonishment, he found the bishop's proctors willing to gratify his desire. He very honestly tells us that he considered them to have been infatuated, but he does not hesitate to take advantage of their folly, though he wonders that they should risk the cause of their employer, who could gain nothing by such a course, because he was already in possession of the right he claimed, and it was the business of the monks to attack him.

Thomas was, perhaps, not altogether without doubts as to the meaning of this readiness on the part of the bishop's proctor, to put their master's cause in such evident peril. After much seeking and reflection, he learned that they were anxious to quit Rome on account of the sickliness of the season. When he saw that they were more careful of their own health than of the cause intrusted to their faithfulness, he took courage, and despised his adversaries. Hereupon he advises his brethren never to commit their causes to mercenaries, but only to monks, or to persons associated with monks, who hold the interest of their house, which was to have a perpetual existence, to be of more value than the life of one of its members.

On the day appointed, early in December, 1205, the litigants appeared before the court, presided over by Pope Innocent III. in person. Thomas had retained four of the most eminent lawyers, and his adversary complained to the Pope of this proceeding. His Holiness smiled, and said there was no lack of lawyers in the Roman court. The fees were not heavy, for the highest was but twelve shillings each court day; the second and the third lawyer received nine shillings each, and the fourth was content with four shillings and sixpence. Thomas saw one of his lawyers afterwards as a Spanish bishop sitting in the great Lateran Council, 1215. The pleadings were opened by Robert of Clipston, a man learned in the law, both civil and canon, though he had made the mistake of assuming the responsibility of being plaintiff in a suit where he might have been only

defendant. His eloquence was rather troublesome, for the Pope was wearied with the introductory part of his speech, and told him to address himself to the substance of his case. However, he was not quite master of his words, and could not compress them within reasonable limits. Thomas thinks he was somewhat put out, because he confined himself to the justification of the sentence of the delegates, the confirmation of which he demanded. He said nothing of the merits of the question, viz., as to the right of the bishop to the jurisdiction conceded to him by the delegates, but which may have been, for all that had yet appeared, a mere usurpation on the part of the bishops of Worcester; and it does not seem that the monastery objected to the sentence, so far as the delegates were concerned.

Thomas now rose to reply, and began by asking if it was necessary for him to say anything of the bishop's actual possession, because it was so recent and only for the moment. This was ignoring all the pleadings of Robert. The Pope desired him to speak to the real merits of the case, and discuss the exemption of the monastery from the jurisdiction of the bishop. Thomas then, *flens et ejulans*, renouncing all the arts of the orator in word, but using them in fact—as men are wont to do who protest that they mean to forego such aids—entered on the history of the abbey, produced the bulls, and argued on their meaning, which he maintained exempted the monastery from the visitation of the bishop for ever. He showed that the monks of Evesham were subjects of the Pope, not of the bishop, and that they were protected against the latter by the Apostolic privileges in every possible way and in all possible cases. He ended his speech by a prayer that the Holy See would for the future protect the abbey against the bishop, even if the old privileges were not extensive enough, though he thought they were perfectly clear and sufficient for the purpose. He consented, nevertheless, to obey the bishop, if in anything the bishop had a right to command him. His Holiness was a little amused, and, when Thomas had ended, turned to the cardinals and said: "Well, he takes everything away from the bishop, and then says, let him have what remains!"

Robert of Clipston was now called upon to reply, and his answer was, that the bulls produced were forgeries, and, in particular, that of Pope Constantine, which he said was unknown in England. Thomas was ordered to produce them, which he did, and the Pope examined them minutely in open court. Thomas shook with fear at this, and is unable to repress the terror that then overwhelmed him when he saw the Pope handle the bulls and pull the thread that held the seal.

The examination seems to have been a rigid one: the bulls were handed to the cardinals, who also scrutinized them, and at last they came back into the hands of the Pontiff, who, to the unutterable joy of Thomas, said, "These are genuine; though you may not know them, we know them well: they are not forgeries." The Pope then rose, and assigned them the third day from that for the further hearing of the cause.

On the third day Robert of Clipston argued before the Consistory that the privileges of the abbey had been lost by non-usage, and that the bishops of Worcester had prescription against the monks, who had in many ways submitted to episcopal control. The facts were enumerated, and were admitted by the opposite side; for, simply as facts, they were notorious, and could not be denied. Abbots of Evesham had been careless, and had neglected their rights. When Robert had concluded his proofs, Thomas was called upon to say what he could allege to destroy the value of these acts and in reply to the plea of prescription set up and proved. Thomas admitted that the bishops of Worcester had exercised jurisdiction in and over the abbey; but he maintained that no right could be inferred therefrom, because the monks had always resisted and protested. Some of the acts alleged were without prejudice, because the bishop had been invited to perform them; and the appearance of the abbot in the diocesan synods was explained by the fact that the abbey held some churches which were not exempt from the diocesan rule. The facts of the case having been thus settled and admitted by both sides, the Pope called upon the consistorial lawyers employed by both parties to argue the question of law, the proctors having been obliged to confine themselves to facts. The lawyers occupied two court days in the discussion, at the end of which there remained only one point for further argument, which Thomas settled triumphantly by the help of knowledge furnished him by the great Azo* at Bologna, and for which, according to his account, he had to pay.

The trial was now over, and nothing remained but to wait for the sentence of the Sovereign Pontiff. Thomas shall tell his story in his own words:—

Aware that human means were exhausted, I had recourse to Divine, to the intercession of the saints, almsgiving, prayer, and fasting. This was on a

* "Quas a domino Assone tunc temporis legum dominorum domino Bononiæ non sine pretio didiceram" (p. 168). If this be Azo, whom Baldus called the fountain of law and the vessel of election, the received accounts that he was dead in 1200 must be incorrect; and there must therefore be a mistake in the restored monument to his memory which is copied by Forster, "Histor. Juris."

Thursday, and Christmas-day fell on the following Sunday. I visited the shrines of the saints, and commended to them myself and the cause of my church: to every poor man I met, whether asked or not, I gave alms of the goods of the church of Evesham, persevering in prayer and fasting till after the sentence was delivered on Christmas-eve. Early on Saturday morning I went into court, and as each of the cardinals came in I embraced his feet, revealing by tears rather than by words the affliction of my soul. I entreated them to have compassion on their servants and their church. So earnest was I in my importunities, that not only the cardinals, but my opponents also, and all who saw me, felt compassion for me. I was still persevering in prayer when, about noon, our lord the Pope came out of his room with the cardinals. When he had taken his seat, the proctors of Evesham and Worcester were called. I was comforted when I heard myself first mentioned, though the apparitors of the court had generally called me first because I had been liberal to them, in order to get into court the more readily. We now stood, as we were accustomed to stand, over against one another on two sides of the court; but the Pope, on seeing us, said, "Stand together in the middle, for there is no dispute now between you: I have made peace." At first I did not understand, but afterwards, when the Holy Ghost was given us by the sentence of our lord the Pope, all this became clear. When we had stood together, the Pope said, "The cause depending between our venerable brother the bishop of Worcester and our beloved children the abbot and monks of Evesham, touching the subjection and exemption of that monastery, we have carefully examined, and, after inspecting and clearly understanding the bulls and evidences produced, have by our written sentence determined: and now, departing from our usual custom, we order our sentence to be read." Then Master Philip, Prothonotary, afterwards bishop of Troja, rose and said:—"To the abbot and brethren of the monastery of Evesham." When I heard these words my spirit revived within me, for I knew the Pope's style, for he always directed the briefs to the successful litigant. When the sentence had been read, all of us went and threw ourselves at the Pope's feet, both plaintiff and defendant, as the custom is, and thanked him; but when I was stooping down to kiss the feet of our lord the Pope, I fainted away for joy, and through weakness induced by fasting. . . . At the door of the court I met Adam Sortes (a monk of Evesham), bringing certain papers from home. Him I embraced, and took to my lodgings, and as soon as we had tasted food we were comforted, and gave God thanks for all His benefits, for He had dealt with us according to His great mercy, Who liveth and reigneth world without end. Amen.

Thomas, though victorious, was not yet at liberty, for the sentence in his favour relieved him only of half his burden. He had still to appear before the Pope, and this time in defence of the sentence which the delegates in England had given in favour of the abbey. Robert of Clipston impugned the decision, and claimed the churches of the Vale for his client the bishop. Thomas had to bear the whole weight of this lawsuit himself, because his money was spent, and lawyers could not be found

to plead for nothing. He was not disheartened, and asserted that the churches of the Vale were mere chapels of the great church of the abbey, and, as members of it, must be free. Robert denied this, and said that the churches in question had fonts of their own, there being no font in the Abbey Church. Upon this the Pope interrupted the pleaders, and, looking at Thomas, said, "Proctor, speak the truth; is the font with you, or are there fonts in those churches?" Thomas, thus brought up, was obliged to answer, and the answer was, "We have none; the churches have their own fonts." The observation of the Pope was, "Plead something else." Thomas very honestly adds that this plea was of very little use to him; but he reminds his brethren that if they had had a font for forty years in the abbey, while the churches of the Vale had none, he would have gained his cause. Having been thus foiled in what he regarded as a good argument, he then proceeded to show that the whole territory of the Vale was included in the charters of the monastery, and was really part of it; but, as this was a matter of fact requiring other proofs than the assertion of Thomas, the Pope adjourned the hearing to another day. When the court sat again, the discussion turned upon the sentence of the delegates, and Thomas tried to show that it might be accepted as conclusive; the churches he mentioned were free of episcopal control by prescription and immemorial usage. Here the Pope asked Robert of Clipston whether the monks had really prescription in their favour. Robert admitted the fact, but denied that any prescription could deprive the bishop of his right. "Holy Father," said he, "we have learned in the schools, and it is the opinion of our doctors, that no prescription can prevail against the episcopal rights." The Pope replied, "Well, you and your doctors must have drunk a good deal of beer when you were learning this." * Thomas then argued against this drunken opinion; and at last the Pope, somewhat offended with Robert, who was, it must be admitted, not very earnest in the defence of the bishop, said: "We have heard that the church of Worcester has been vacant more frequently than any other in England, and it may be that, taking vacancies into account, the abbey has not really gained the jurisdiction it claims by prescription." Thomas confesses that the Pope said this as a just judge; but nevertheless he was unable to refrain himself, and said, "Holy Father, yours is the

* "'Pater Sancte, nos didicimus in scholis, et hæc est opinio magistrorum nostrorum, quod non currit præscriptio contra jura episcopalia.' Et Dominus Papa, 'Certe et tu et magistri tui multum bibistis de cerevisiâ Anglicanâ quando hæc didicistis'" (p. 189).

fulness of power, and all things are therefore lawful for you; yet, according to the law, no other judge may help an advocate in matters of fact, but only in matters of law." To this the Pope replied, "You are in error; a judge may help in both." Thomas held his tongue, though he had a grievance, and actually complains that the sentence was delayed through the justice of the Pope. The result was a new commission, and the fact of prescription was to be tried over again in England by the bishops of Ely and Rochester, with Benedict, one of the canons of St. Paul's, London.

It is commonly said that the Popes always favoured the monks whenever they attempted to release themselves from the control of the bishops; and some have gone so far as to say, that money rather than justice, or even expediency, was the moving cause of the many immunities which were enjoyed by religious houses. But in this story of Evesham Abbey there is no trace of anything of the kind; the monks were too much impoverished to pay anybody, and their abbot was, if not hostile, certainly lukewarm in their cause. Thomas of Marlborough, though he gained his suit, admits that the Pope was not favourable to him, or to his views, and says plainly that the bishop had the good wishes of the Sovereign Pontiff, who apparently did not, in the least degree, desire to see the churches of the Vale of Evesham exempt from episcopal control and subject only to the abbey. If the churches of the Vale were exempted originally by a Papal act, that was the work of the bishop of Worcester, who founded the abbey, and who voluntarily resigned whatever rights he had, or his successors might have. If, on the other hand, the abbey obtained the jurisdiction over those churches by prescription, that was the fault of the bishops of Worcester from time to time, and the Pope could give sentence only on the facts proved before him. The bishop asked for his rights, the abbey asked for its rights also, and there was no other means of settling the dispute than that of evidence of possession.

On the 18th January, 1206, was signed and sealed the great sentence by which the abbey recovered its rights, and by which the bishop of Worcester lost the visitation of the monastery for ever. Thomas tried to get it in duplicate, but he failed. He succeeded, however, in procuring its insertion at full length in the executory letters, and this, under the circumstances, was no little advantage, and, indeed, sufficient for his purpose, because he was not likely to get permission to leave Rome himself. The abbot and he had borrowed 400 marks, and the lenders, who had gone to England with the abbot in order to be paid, had returned without their money. They were, therefore, in

no humour to lend more, and were even lying in wait for Thomas, who had himself borrowed fifty marks, that they might put him in prison. More than this, the Pope himself, probably on the application of the creditors, had forbidden Thomas to quit the city. Thomas was not without help; he and the abbot's clerk, and Adam Sortes, were bent on returning; and, as Adam was seriously ill, he was sent secretly away with the executory letters, and Thomas now could contemplate his creditors without very painful emotions. Adam travelled as fast as he could, and presented the letters to the abbot of Westminster and Stanlegh, who were to put them in force; and, on the second Sunday after Easter, which was the ecclesiastical anniversary of the day on which the bishop had entered the abbey the year before, the monks were again free.

Thomas remained in Rome at the mercy of his creditors, to whom he was forced to consign the original sentence by way of pledge for the debt; but he cared little for this now, because it had gone secretly to Evesham in a sufficiently authentic form. The chaplain of the abbot also was still in Rome, and on his falling ill, Thomas sent him home with the Roman creditors, who were to go to Evesham with all the papers, and to deliver them up on payment of their debt. Thomas was detained by the Pope, for reasons not told us, but sorely against his will. According to his own account, it was because he had not made the usual presents to the judges of his cause. Be this as it may, Thomas was not a man to be easily beaten. He visited the shrines of the Apostles, and of the saints of the holy city, and then, mingling in a crowd which was kneeling to receive the Papal benediction, considered himself as blessed, and withdrew secretly from Rome. He expected to be pursued and caught, but he was not—perhaps his absence was never observed—and at last he arrived in England, bent upon accomplishing the deposition of the abbot.

Roger, having escaped out of the hands of the bishop, and looking upon his position as unassailable in any court except that of the Pope himself, began to make the monastery a more comfortable place to govern upon his peculiar principles. He proposed to expel those two disturbers of the peace, Thomas of Marlborough and Thomas of Northwich; but the monks resisted, and made common cause with the intended victims of the abbot's malice. The aged and infirm monks were to remain in the monastery, guardians of the relics and the treasure of the church; the common seal was hid in the ground, and the old men were to offer a passive resistance to the abbot, even to the effusion of their blood. On S. Catherine's day, November 25th, 1206, thirty-two monks left the convent in procession,

with the cross borne before them. The abbot was sitting in his court, administering justice, but he saw that strange procession, and knew at once what it meant. He summoned his friends and retainers to the pursuit, and with swords and staves hurried after the departing Israelites, who were running away from the tyranny of Pharao. Having overtaken them, he bade them return. The habit of obedience was strong, and one of them moved towards the abbot, but was instantly restrained by one of his brethren, who denounced his weakness. Authority now proved powerless, and the monks refused to obey. The abbot directed his men to use material force: against the drawn swords of his retainers, the monks used their staves, and there ensued a serious fight on the road, unarmed priests contending against the mailed soldiers of the abbot. With their wooden staves the monks drove back the abbot's men, and then pursued their journey, giving God thanks that they had lost none of their number, though their enemies had suffered severely.

The abbot did not think it could do him any service to lose his monks in this way, so, collecting his scattered troopers he, followed them again, and now, in a more peaceable manner, endeavoured to move them from their resolution. They consented at last to return upon certain terms—one of which was the surrender of the brief in virtue of which he had expelled the two monks. The brief was delivered up, and instantly torn to pieces. The seal of the monastery was then sent for from its hiding-place, and peace was sealed and sworn to between the abbot and his monks, who in the evening were once more safe at Evesham, but not more reconciled to Roger than was Roger to them.

Meanwhile the bishop of Worcester was prosecuting his claim to the jurisdiction over the churches of the Vale before the Papal commissioners, to whom the Pope had delegated the power to decide the question, provided the litigants would be bound by their decree. After several hearings before the judges, the bishop and the abbot agreed upon a compromise; but the monks refused to be a party to it, and the litigation continued, because it was clearly not to the interest of the abbey to have it brought to an end. In the year 1208 the commission was suspended, because of the interdict of the kingdom brought upon it by the wickedness of king John; nor could it be resumed before the submission of that sovereign to the Pontiff he had outraged. The bishop, Malgerus, was forced to quit the kingdom, and died in July, 1212, at Pontigny, where he had taken refuge from the persecution of the king.

The Roman creditors were in England when John set the

law at defiance and refused to allow Cardinal Langton to take possession of the archbishopric of Canterbury. His wrath fell also upon these innocent men, whom he compelled to give up their securities to his safe-keeping. The papers were kept in the treasury in London, but were afterwards removed to Corfe Castle, and in these removals one of them was lost or stolen. When they recovered them from the king's officers, they brought their action against the monastery of Evesham and claimed the principal of 400 marks, together with 700 more on the ground of expenses and by way of penalty for the delayed payment. Thomas of Marlborough appeared for the abbey, as usual, and pleaded that nothing was due by way of penalty because the king had seized the lands of Evesham, and had made it impossible for the monks to satisfy any of their creditors. The matter after much discussion was compromised, and the creditors consented to accept 500 marks in satisfaction of the whole debt.

Roger Norreys refused to ratify this agreement, and swore that he would never pay it. Thomas remarks ironically upon this—that he must have had the spirit of prophecy when he took that oath. The legate Nicholas, bishop of Frascati, was now in England, and in November, 1213, went down to Evesham to investigate the story of that unhappy monastery, and to administer to it the justice it had need of. Now, at last, the time had come when the long-forbearing monks could tell their grievances and demand justice in the presence of one whose jurisdiction they all acknowledged. No rights of the abbey could be compromised now, and no alien could enter in. They had been patient and silent for more than twenty years; they had suffered hunger and thirst; they had been scantily clad in winter, and they had been rendered unable to keep their rule; they had been more than once offered relief, but, as its acceptance involved the loss of rights and the encroachments of usurped jurisdiction, they generously forbore, and endured affliction, waiting for the true Moses, who was to deliver them out of the hands of the oppressor. The Papal legate was a lawful judge.

The legate, surrounded by his clerks, and with many abbots in his train, sat down in the chapter-house of Evesham, and bade Thomas open pleadings against Roger, the unworthy abbot. Thomas at first was silent, but at last he spoke, and to some purpose. He gave a biography of the abbot in the abbot's hearing. He described the ruin of the monastery, temporal and spiritual, the neglect of the divine office, the dilapidations of the property, the intrusion of the abbot, and his tyrannical rule. When the terrible story had been all told, the abbot was called upon for his answer. Roger could not deny the

facts, but he objected to the admission of the witnesses, because they were his monks, and banded together in a conspiracy to procure his deposition. The legate overruled the objection, and Roger had no other defence; for, the witnesses once admitted, his case was gone. Even now the legate showed mercy in his justice: he asked Roger to resign,—it was the only way to save his reputation. Roger at first refused; but after a little reflection he consented, and the legate cut the knot that bound him to the abbey. But as the man had been a monk, though a scandalous one, and had filled so conspicuous a place as that of abbot of Evesham, the legate would not humble him more than he could help. The prior of Penwortham, in Lancashire —no other than Adam Sortes, who had taken refuge there,— wished to return to the abbey from which the harshness of Roger had driven him; and, accordingly, the legate replaced him by the fallen abbot. Roger seems to have been hopelessly incurable; even now he did not repent, and the legate, at the end of five months, was compelled to remove him. Roger now went to Rome, but he obtained no help there; on his return, he offered his wretched services to the bishop of Worcester, and whatever ill he could do to the abbey that he did; but his strength was not equal to his will. He was now a monk loose on the world, as he was when Baldwin and Richard sent him, to their great discredit, to be abbot of Evesham. At last another legate, Pandulf, had pity on him and sent him back to Penwortham, where he lived nearly six years. During that interval, with death drawing nearer day by day, he refused to be reconciled to the monks of Evesham. They were anxious about his soul, and entreated him to be at peace with them; but he would not listen, and the miserable man, so far as the monks knew, died in his uncharitable spirit, hating the monks whose very bread he was eating, and to which he had no right; for he had never been one of the monks of the abbey which he had so scandalously outraged by his wicked life and graceless demeanour.

The litigation about the churches of the Vale rested now with the bishops of Worcester, for the abbey was content with the sentence of the delegates. Thomas had discovered and denounced in Rome an act of the bishops which was not likely to help them. It seems that when secular priests had been deans of the Valley they had paid to the bishops of Worcester the sum of one pound, which was due for Peter's pence,* and

* It may interest some to learn that the tax of Peter's pence was a fixed sum, levied on each diocese separately, without reference to the number of houses or of persons. The largest sum, £42, was levied on Lincoln; and the smallest, £5, was raised in the diocese of Ely.

that the bishops had not accounted for that sum to the Papal treasury,— "defraudantes Ecclesiam Romanam" (p. 199).

After defending the abbey for so many years, it became the duty of Thomas one day to accept the dignity of abbot, to which he was raised by the unanimous voice of his brethren. During his rule the lawsuit lingered, and he was not disposed to move in it. He had gone to his eternal rest before the bishops of Worcester finally retired from the contest, and the jurisdiction of the Valley was vested, beyond dispute, in the monks, after a struggle of nearly half a century. At the dissolution of the abbeys, the contested jurisdiction was still held by the monastery; and even then it was not given to the bishop, nor, at a later time, to the protestants who entered in upon the possessions of the church. That jurisdiction was given away—if given away it was—to Christ Church, Oxford, together with the churches of the Vale: "For six hundred years the diocesan remained deprived of his jurisdiction," says Mr. Macray (p. xxvii., note), but on what principle passes our understanding. The diocesan never had a church in the Valley that owned his rule; for when S. Egwyn obtained the land, it was a barren and waste place; the bishop's jurisdiction was, by S. Egwyn's own act, excluded before a stone of the abbey was laid, or a single church raised in that desolate country. Mr. Macray is also, in our opinion, very unfair in his appreciation of the monks, whom he blames for seeking the deposition of Roger Norreys for his "injustice and harshness to themselves" rather than for his "notorious immorality." They were certainly not anxious to reveal the turpitudes even of Roger, who had but small claim on their forbearance, because he was not one of them, but had been thrust upon them by the power of the king and the archbishop; and surely this is to their credit. They spared the abbot, who never spared them; held their tongues from detraction; and were satisfied, in the pursuit of justice, to obtain it with as little scandal as possible, and in a way that would leave Roger the amplest means of mending his life without making public the great sins that stained it. The monks saw things in the light of charity as well as in that of justice, and we do not think that Mr. Macray perfectly appreciates their position.

Art. III.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The Greek Testament. By Henry Alford, D.D. London: Strahan & Co. 1859.

THE controversy about the authorship and writership of the Epistle to the Hebrews comes down from ancient times, and it may fairly be called a vexed question if ever there was one. Various opinions obtained in different portions of the early Church, and after being laid to rest for a thousand years they have been resuscitated and still further multiplied by Protestant criticism from Luther downwards. Germany, as might be expected, takes a leading part in the controversy, and we can discover every phase and shade of opinion with some German name attached, from the ultra-Pauline views of Bengel to the most anti-Pauline (at least, in principle, if not in expression) of Michaelis in his later days. Bengel, followed by many, held that the Greek, as we have it, is S. Paul's own.

Michaelis, on second thoughts, considered it more probable that S. Paul was not the author; and this opinion, strange to say, he combines with the conviction that the Epistle was originally written in Hebrew, though the argument, which in all ages has weighed most against the Authorship of S. Paul, is founded upon the different style of the Greek; and to allow that the Greek is a translation would have seemed to most commentators like a concession that the original was the work of S. Paul. Michaelis * is worth quoting, if only to show the "desolating" effect of severe research. He seems to have reasoned himself into a state of nicely-balanced doubt about the author, and into the downright denial of our having even so much as heard the name of the translator. "The arguments, therefore," he says (c. xxiv., sec. 16), "on both sides of the question are nearly of equal weight; but, if there is any preponderance, it is in favour of the opinion that S. Paul was not the author." And of the translator he remarks (c. xxiv., sec. 14):—"Neither in any other book of the New Testament, nor in the works of any Christian writer of the first century, is there any resemblance to the style of this Epistle; it must have proceeded, therefore, from a person of whom we have no other writings now extant."

Of the modern Germans, and they are many, who withhold the

* Introduction to the New Testament. By John David Michaelis. Translated from the Fourth Edition of the German by Herbert Marsh, B.D. Cambridge. 1801.

Epistle from S. Paul, some say, with Luther, that Apollos was the author; some support Barnabas or others of the ancient claimants; some are content to ascribe it to a disciple of the Apostle, without venturing upon any closer determination.

Dean Alford, in his interesting Prolegomena to the Epistle, reminds us that Catholics no longer enjoy the same liberty of discussion as formerly. We give his words:—"Finally, the Council of Trent, in 1546, closed up the question for Romanists by declaring, 'Testamenti Novi . . . quatuordecim epistolæ Pauli Apos., ad Rom. &c., ad Hebræos.' So that the best divines of that church have since then had only that way open to them of expressing an intelligent judgment, which holds the matter of the Epistle to be S. Paul's, but the style and arrangement that of some other person: so Bellarmine, &c.; so Estius, in his introduction to the Epistle, which is well worth reading, as a remarkable instance of his ability and candour." The introductory dissertation from which we borrow these words, for lucid arrangement and compendious treatment, commands our admiration and even our gratitude, though we are too often forced to dissent from its conclusions. If the learned Dean had not, as we take it, grievously misapprehended the meaning of a passage from Origen, which he quotes at length, and from which he selects a sentence for the text of his discovery, he would no doubt have gone on to say, that the only way now open to Catholic divines of expressing an intelligent judgment is the very way which the great Alexandrian freely chose from all other ways long centuries before the infallible decree of Trent had been put forth to hamper the intelligence of the faithful.

We willingly, nay thankfully, admit that the field of discussion has been made much narrower by the definition of the Council. We only regret that it has not been made far more narrow, and that all the minor questions have not been "closed up" by a competent judge as satisfactorily as the main point at issue. Estius thinks that it would be impossible, without temerity, to deny that S. Paul is, at all events, the primary author of the Epistle. If, after some fourteen centuries of unanimity, and a few plain words from a General Council, we Catholics are unable to meet Protestant critics on their own ground of universal scepticism, or, as it would be phrased, unbiassed inquiry, we cannot consent to receive commiseration on that account. Men who are in possession of the truth need not lament that they are no longer obliged to go forth in quest of it. Still Catholics are not debarred by this foregone conclusion from their full right to investigate facts and to scrutinize arguments, and, while adhering upon higher motives to a conclusion which has been tendered to them ready formed for their unconditional acceptance, to judge for themselves with perfect freedom

how far history and criticism seem to bear it out. In matters of dogma Catholics certainly do not profess to be impartial, for faith and doubt cannot co-exist; but neither are they prepared to admit what is often quietly assumed, that impartiality and private judgment always go hand in hand. There is a partiality inspired by love, but there is a partiality also which springs from hatred; there is a mental bias produced by habits of obedience, but there is also a mental bias coming from natural antagonism, prejudice, the spirit of contradiction. What stanch, unflinching Protestant, for instance, of the good old Newdegate type, would or could for one brief moment hesitate to pin his faith on that solution of our present question which asserts Apollos for the author, did he but know that it was Luther who invented the idea, and that this one alone among all the rival theories had never been contaminated by the suffrage of a single Catholic name?

It will be well, first, to examine into the history of the doubt; and, secondly, to endeavour to account for its existence, and to trace it back to the origin. S. Clement of Rome, the helper of S. Paul, whose name was written in the Book of Life (Phil. iv. 3), quotes largely from the Epistle to the Hebrews, and cannot well have failed to know who its author was; but unfortunately he had a habit of introducing all his Scripture texts with terribly indeterminate formulas: "For the Scripture says"; "For so it is written"; "And again elsewhere (Holy Scripture) sayeth." Only once does he mention an Epistle of S. Paul's with his name, and that is in chap. xlvii. of his letter to the Corinthians, where, without quoting any text, he reminds his readers of the Epistle which they had received from S. Paul. Certainly we cannot argue from this solitary passage that he would have been sure to tell us that S. Paul wrote to the Hebrews if only he had been aware of the fact. We can derive no argument one way or another from S. Clement; neither can we argue back to S. Clement from Roman writers of a later date, and say that these could not have been ignorant that S. Paul was the author, and could still less have rejected him, unless S. Clement either had not known, or had not transmitted his knowledge. That S. Clement should not have known the Epistle as S. Paul's is difficult to conceive; that, knowing this, he should not have imparted the knowledge to others is more difficult to conceive; but that a tradition of the Pauline authorship of a letter, albeit perhaps started under the fairest auspices, should have been obscured, or even lost, in the hundred years intervening between Clement and Caius, interrupted as they were by persecution and hiding in catacombs,—this assuredly no one need feel any difficulty in admitting as possible, not to say probable. Because a Roman priest, about A.D. 200, says that S. Paul was not the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we

cannot, therefore, infer that the silence of S. Clement, about A.D. 100, was necessarily the silence of ignorance. Eusebius of Cæsarea is the first who mentions the testimony of Caius, or Gaius, and speaks of the feeling in the Roman Church. S. Jerome repeats the account, and brings down to his own time the observations of Eusebius, made some half a century before. In his "Catalogue of Illustrious Men," he says (c. 59) :—

> In the Pontificate of Zephyrinus, Bishop of Rome, that is, in the time of Antoninus, son of Severus (or about A.D. 200), Gaius had a very famous dispute with a follower of Montanus, Proculus by name, whom he accused of rashness in defending the New Prophecy. In his work he enumerates only thirteen Epistles of Paul, saying that the fourteenth, commonly styled the Epistle to the Hebrews, is not one of his. And indeed, among the Romans to this day, it is not regarded as belonging to the Apostle Paul.

He says the same of the Romans in his letter to Dardanus, which we shall have occasion to quote soon. He says the same in his commentary on Isaias (l. 3 in Is. vi. 2), and again in his commentary on Zacharias (l. 2 in Zach. viii. 1).

There can be no doubt that the Roman Church, down to S. Jerome's time, gave little sign of accepting this Epistle as S. Paul's; indeed, the Romans seemed to have looked upon its canonicity as not fully established until after the time of S. Ambrose. But it is important for our future argument to remark, that the earliest testimony is purely negative. It avails to prove the existence of a doubt, but does not attain the dignity of a counter tradition. To S. Clement of Rome we may add S. Irenæus, who belongs alike to East and West, whose genuine writings contain no reference to the Epistle; and Novatian, the heresiarch, who was a priest of the Roman Church, though his influence was greatest in Africa. It is indeed a strong argument that S. Paul was not recognized in Rome for the author of the Epistle, to find even Novatian silent on the subject; for it would have served his purpose well to have found in the 6th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews an unquestioned Apostolic declaration in his favour; and his followers were not slow to discover, or scrupulous in making the most of their discovery, that some of the difficult things which S. Paul there says lend great countenance, at first sight, to their Jansenist-like rigorism.

Still, even Novatian's silence can prove nothing more than what has been freely granted, the existence of grave doubt; and if these negative arguments, in which the main strength of the Anti-Pauline cause is found, are to be deemed conclusive against S. Paul's authorship, they must be deemed no less conclusive against the canonicity of the Epistle. *Ipsi viderint.* Our German Pro-

testant friends, in their anxiety to get rid of S. Paul, are unconsciously arguing against themselves upon another count. Luther was at least consistent when he denied both the apostolicity of the Epistle and its authority.

In the African Church we find Tertullian denying, and S. Cyprian apparently ignorant of, S. Paul's share in the matter; and this seems the sum total of the evidence to be gathered in that portion of the Church up to the time of S. Augustine. Tertullian quietly, and without comment, in his Montanist work, "De Pudicitia," ascribes the Epistle to S. Barnabas.

S. Cyprian never uses the Epistle once. But this need scarcely surprise us; for not only was he a devoted admirer of Tertullian, and in literary matters a faithful follower, accustomed to settle knotty points of criticism by a compendious "da magistrum"; but, moreover, he was engaged in hot dispute with Novatian, and as long as Novatian was willing to keep aloof from the Epistle to the Hebrews, S. Cyprian would not be over eager to furnish his adversary with new weapons of attack, even supposing that he entertained on this point different views from his master.

By the time of S. Ambrose a change seems to have set in. This great bishop and doctor quotes the Epistle freely, and fearlessly ascribes it to S. Paul. In his treatise "de Pœnit." he devotes two whole chapters (cc. ii. and iii.) to a vindication of Heb. vi., assuming it as S. Paul's.

It will be well to see what S. Jerome and S. Augustine thought about the subject before we pass on to the Eastern Church.

S. Jerome constantly quotes the Epistle, and ascribes it to S. Paul, as if he had no doubt on the point; but he mentions more than once, as we have seen, the doubt which existed in the Roman Church. Some remarks which he makes in his letter to Dardanus (Ep. 129, §. 3) are by many thought to outweigh all his practical acceptance of the Epistle. We must judge for ourselves. In this letter, then, to Dardanus, S. Jerome, after making in immediate succession four somewhat lengthy citations, which he introduces with the remark,—"The Vessel of Election speaketh to the Hebrews," concludes with a passage which is very celebrated in this controversy:—

"Those who belong to us" (*i.e.* Christians), he says, "will do right to maintain, that this Epistle, which bears title 'To the Hebrews,' is accepted as coming from the Apostle Paul, not only by the Churches of the East, but by all the ecclesiastical writers in the Greek language down to the present day, although many of them (plerique) * deem it the work either of Barnabas or of Clement; and that it really matters not from whom we

* This translation is justified afterwards.

have it, seeing that it certainly is from some approved ecclesiastical writer, and is authorized by daily reading in the churches. If, however, the practice of the Latins does not give it admission among the Canonical Scriptures, neither, be it remembered, do the Churches of the Greeks accept with the same facility the Apocalypse of John; yet we accept both these works, by no means following herein the practice of these times, but yielding deference to the authority of ancient writers, who very frequently (plerumque) adduce testimonies both from the one and from the other, not as they are sometimes wont to deal with apocryphal writings (occasionally they draw instances even from pagan literature), but as canonical and ecclesiastical writings." *

There is a difficulty in this passage without doubt, and it even seems to contradict itself; but then Dean Alford's solution can scarcely be the right one. He pushes "plerique" to its fullest meaning, and then distinguishes between "suscipi" and "arbitrentur," assigning to the former term the narrow and exclusive sense of mere conventional accepting. His words are:—

Now, though these expressions are not very perspicuous, it is not difficult to see what is meant by them. A general conventional reception (susceptio) of the Epistle as S. Paul's prevailed among the Greeks. To this their writers (without exception, according to Jerome; but that is a loose assertion, as the preceding pages will show) conformed, still, in most cases, entertaining their own views as to Barnabas or Clement having written the Epistle, and thinking it of little moment, seeing that confessedly it was the work of a "vir ecclesiasticus," and was stamped with the authority of public reading in the churches.

This is ingenious and plausible enough; but, after admitting that the expressions are not very perspicuous, and that Jerome is making loose assertions, it would be a decidedly shorter way out of the difficulty to suppose that S. Jerome said "plerique," when it would have been better to have said "plures"; † and then we

* "Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, non solum ab ecclesiis Orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Græci sermonis Scriptoribus, quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi, licet plerique eam vel Barnabæ vel Clementis arbitrentur; et nihil interesse cujus sit, quum ecclesiastici viri sit, et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur. Quod si eam Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter Scripturas canonicas; nec Græcorum quidem ecclesiæ Apocalypsin Joannis eadem libertate suscipiunt; et tamen nos utramque suscipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum Scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes, qui plerumque utriusque abutuntur testimoniis, non ut interdum de apocryphis facere solent, quippe qui et Gentilium literarum raro utuntur exemplis, sed quasi canonicis et ecclesiasticis."

† Our rendering of "plerique" receives some countenance from the use in this very passage of the kindred word, "plerumque." Certainly S. Jerome did not mean to say that the ancient writers drew their quotations *for the most part* from the Epistle to the Hebrews and from the Apocalypse.

may dispense with all subtilizing about conventional "susceptio" as opposed to internal judgment, especially where the word "suscipere" is immediately after employed twice over in its ordinary and fuller sense, and we have only to say that he shows his own opinion pretty clearly by the terms in which he speaks of the Epistle, not only where he quotes from it in his other writings, but also in this very passage, in which, as we have seen, he starts his observations with a "Vas electionis loquitur"; and that, nevertheless, while he thus discloses to us his mind on the subject, he is laudably careful not to force his own opinion on the acceptance of his readers. Might we not call it conventionalism run mad, thus to preface with an emphatic assertion of S. Paul's authorship that very passage in which he was undertaking to show that S. Paul was not really the author after all? The habit of appealing to the "Vas electionis" must have been very deeply rooted indeed if, in the very act of declaring its inaccuracy, he could not refrain from using the offensive formula. Add to this, that if S. Jerome did mean "plerique" to be understood accurately, he would have intended to say what was either manifestly untrue, or a pure assertion, without proof or the possibility of proof. If we are to judge of what the Greek writers thought by referring to what they wrote, then, as we shall soon see, it is manifestly untrue that *most of them* (plerique) believed that the Epistle came from Clement or Barnabas. Olshausen (Opuscula, p. 95), quoted in the able summary of opinion upon the Epistle to the Hebrews in Dr. Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," says:—"No one is named, either in Egypt or in Syria, Palestine, Asia, or Greece, who is opposed to the opinion that this Epistle proceeds from S. Paul."

If, on the other hand, we venture to say, that the Greek writers wrote one thing and thought another, how can this ever be anything but the purest of unprovable assertions? What means have we, or had S. Jerome, of arriving at such a conclusion? To divine the thoughts of men, who are lying in their graves, and this not only without any clue from their writings, but actually in contradiction to all they ever wrote, would be a perfection of clairvoyance to which S. Jerome certainly was a stranger, for we have not arrived at it yet. Can there be a greater absurdity than to explain what a man has actually said by what he may be imagined to have thought, instead of trying to make out what he must have thought by examining what he actually said? It is difficult to see why those rather random words in the letter to Dardanus ought to be taken as by themselves alone sufficing to outweigh the practice of a lifetime, and a practice persevered in at the very time when S. Jerome (according to those who wish to have him on their side as the opponent of the Pauline authorship) is apologising for that practice, and making what excuse he can to save its truthfulness at the expense of its accuracy.

S. Augustine like S. Jerome quotes freely from the Epistle, which he sometimes ascribes to S. Paul, though more frequently he commits himself to no statement about the author. Like S. Jerome, again, he is laudably careful to record the doubts of others. In the work De Civitate Dei (l. xvi. c. 22), we find after an allusion to Melchisedech the addition: "Of whom many glorious things are written in the Epistle inscribed to the Hebrews, which according to many is from the Apostle Paul, though this is denied by some."

These words were probably written about A.D. 416, and by that time we have had abundant proof of what S. Augustine himself thought about the Epistle. He was present as a priest at the Council of Hippo, A.D. 393, and as a bishop at the Third Council of Carthage, A.D. 398, and in both these Councils the Epistle was unequivocally ascribed to S. Paul.* In the acts of the latter Council (Can. 47 : Labbe, t. 2, p. 1409) we find a list of the canonical books, exactly coinciding, except in the arrangement of some of the books of the Old Testament, with the Canon of Trent; and in their proper place we find, "thirteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul: one of the Hebrews by the same." An ancient copy bore an appended suggestion: "Let the Church across the sea be consulted touching the confirmation of this Canon." As a sufficient expression of what the Roman Church had by this time come to think on the subject, we may take the enumeration of canonical books in the letter of Innocent I., written in the year 405 (Ep. 6, ad Exsuperium Tolosanum, c. 7 : Labbe, t. 3, p. 15), in which are included "fourteen Epistles of the Apostle Paul." Thenceforward we hear little more about Roman or African doubts. Not only at Councils in which he took a distinguished part, but expressly in so many words, and even before the year 400, S. Augustine had made his own profession of faith in his treatise, De Doctrinâ Christianâ (l. 2, c. 8), where he enumerates all the fourteen Epistles of S. Paul in their present order, saving that the two to the Thessalonians are put between the Philippians and Colossians. What does it matter to us, after this, if he introduces a quotation now and again with some such remark as (De Civ. Dei, l. 10, c. 5): "In the Epistle which is inscribed to the Hebrews"? Are we to infer that he himself did not believe in S. Paul's authorship, after his express declaration to the contrary? or are we rather to suppose that, as he has told us already in the passage quoted from the sixteenth book of the same work, he, no less than S. Jerome, was perfectly cognizant of the existence of a doubt not then closed up by competent authority, and that, with a modesty for which he was conspicuous in those days of hot polemics, he

* See Hefele, Conciliengesch. Syn. zu Hippo (vol. ii. p. 55).

refused to lay down the law dogmatically until Rome had spoken in a definition on the matter? To admit that a question is still open in the Church is certainly not the same thing as to express personal doubt on the subject. Both S. Jerome and S. Augustine in several places admit that the claims of the Epistle to the Hebrews had been, and still were, controverted; but to which side of the controversy they themselves incline ought, we think, to be clear enough from the practice of S. Jerome, to which his hazy letter to Dardanus is no way opposed, if it be explained according to the hermeneutics of common sense, and from the express words of S. Augustine, which are nowhere contradicted by his practice, and are often helped out by it.

The great African councils of S. Augustine's time were the first utterances of authority which we find about our Epistle, and how much of their inspiration is due to his master mind all church-historians know. It might be nearer to the truth, if, instead of accusing S. Augustine of anti-Pauline views, we were to say that he has done more perhaps than any other individual man to bring about the "closing up for Romanists" of all views but one, namely, that S. Paul was at any rate the primary author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

To pass now to the East.

Clement of Alexandria, whose words are given by Eusebius (H.E., l. 6, c. 14), affirms that S. Paul wrote the Epistle in Hebrew, and that S. Luke translated it, and he finds sufficient reason for the omission of S. Paul's name in his unpopularity with the Jews. Then he adds the reasons given by his master Pantænus, whom he calls "that blessed priest": these are, that S. Paul (Heb. iii. 1) calls Christ an Apostle, and cannot bring himself almost in the same breath to apply the same title to himself; and also, that he was writing to the Jews, not as their own special apostle, but as one undertaking a work of supererogation (ἐκ περιουσίας). Whether these reasons *are* so silly as to make the testimony of Pantænus of small value, we leave to Dean Alford to decide; for ourselves, we care more for the fact of the testimony; and perhaps, the more it is shown that the "blessed priest" was an old simpleton, the less likely it will appear that he was originating an entirely new idea, and the more likely it will appear that he was only telling what he had been told by others; that he was in fact witnessing to a tradition.

Clement of Alexandria in his constant practice bears out his expressed conviction. We find him quoting the Epistle boldly as S. Paul's, quite undeterred by any consideration of the part which, according to him, S. Luke had had in reducing it to what was then, as now, the only known form. Origen did not adopt

his master's opinion about the translation. His words deserve, and shall hereafter receive, a careful examination.

After Origen's time the Alexandrine writers to a man held the Pauline authorship; and this means much, for they were the critics of their age; and it may be as well to remark that they were also the natural interpreters of the meaning of their own great Doctor. Dean Alford not only allows, but insists, that the after-practice was traceable to Origen's influence; it was, in other words, not only "post," but also "propter." Before relating how the idea of the Pauline authorship spread rapidly through all the Eastern Church, he rightly cautions the student against the juvenile error of attaching too much importance to the mere multiplication of witnesses. But he certainly pushes this principle too far. Witnesses who blindly follow the lead of their principal are, of course, for any moral weight that their testimony could add, to be regarded as mere ciphers, if not worse; but it is an assertion as startling as it is sweeping, it is an assertion which would be very much the better for a little proving, to say that all the Fathers of the Alexandrine, Asiatic, African, and Roman Churches, who lived after a given date, were blindly following the lead of one or two master spirits who went before. Eusebius of Cæsarea, S. John Chrysostom, S. Basil, S. Gregory of Nazianzum, and not a few more, were men eminently able to think for themselves. They were not in other matters by any means slavish imitators of one another, or of antecedent doctors; if anything, they erred through too great freedom and boldness in their speculations, wherever they did not recognize the presence of overbearing tradition. In all questions open to discussion they manifested a striking originality of thought, and it is altogether too much to ask us to believe that in this particular matter of the Epistle to the Hebrews they were eager to surrender their intellectual freedom to the *ipse dixit* of a man whom most of them, however unjustly, regarded as a heretic. Of course they never attempted to deny his learning, but they were less disposed to trust implicitly to one who was known to be not always a safe guide. We may be sure that his criticisms were tested by some of these Greek minds, and that they were accepted, not blindly, but upon convincing proof. They must too have had many independent sources of information altogether unknown to us.

To return to Origen. Eusebius of Cæsarea has embalmed in his Church History (l. vi. c. 25), and thus preserved to our day, two pregnant fragments of the great Alexandrian.

In the first he declares: "That the diction of the Epistle entitled 'To the Hebrews' does not betray the simplicity of speech peculiar to the Apostle, who says of himself that he is unskilled in words, that is to say, in studied language; but that the Epistle is

more thoroughly Greek in its style of composition, as every one competent to pronounce upon differences of idiom will confess. And again, that the thoughts are admirable, and not inferior to the undisputed writings of the Apostle, as every one conversant with his writings will readily allow."

The second fragment runs thus: "If I were to give my opinion, I should say that the thoughts are the Apostle's, but that the phraseology and construction are the work of some one who jotted down the apostolic utterances, and put them together after the fashion of a scholar taking notes of what his master has said. If then any Church hold this Epistle to be Paul's, it deserves respect for its opinion; for it is not without reason that those who lived before us have handed it down as Paul's. But who is the writer of the Epistle, to tell the truth, God He knoweth. In the account, as it comes down to us, we have some asserting that it was Clement, sometime Bishop of Rome, who wrote this letter; and others that it was Luke, the same that wrote the Gospel and the Acts."*

Now, in this last passage, we must, with Dean Alford's leave, maintain that Origen lays down his judgment of the authorship as clearly as it can be conveyed in words, at least without the aid of *italics*. That judgment we do aver to be that the thoughts (*τὰ νοήματα*), as distinguished from the words, are S. Paul's, and that the words belong to somebody else. No other sense can we extract after not one, nor two, but twenty readings. This interpretation seems the obvious one, and at the same time the one which is best borne out by study of the context and of all the adjuncts. When the writer has just been saying that the words belong to somebody else (*τινός*), how very natural it is that he should follow up such a remark by further remarking, that only God knows who this "somebody else" is; and how very unnatural that, with a "somebody" close at hand and ready to lay claim to any expression of uncertainty, he should

---

"Ετι πρὸς τούτοις περὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς ἐν ταῖς εἰς αὐτὴν ὁμιλίαις ταῦτα διαλαμβάνει·

"ὅτι ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογήσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, τουτέστι τῇ φράσει· ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως Ἑλληνικωτέρα, πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνειν φράσεων διαφορὰς ὁμολογήσαι ἄν. πάλιν τε αὖ ὅτι τὰ νοήματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαυμάσιά ἐστι, καὶ οὐ δεύτερα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογουμένων γραμμάτων, καὶ τοῦτο ἂν συμφήσαι εἶναι ἀληθὲς πᾶς ὁ προσέχων τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῇ ἀποστολικῇ."

τούτοις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιφέρει λέγων·

"ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος εἴποιμ' ἂν ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ Ἀποστόλου ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντός τινος τὰ ἀποστολικά, καὶ ὡσπερεὶ σχολιογραφήσαντος τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. Εἴ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη εὐδοκιμείτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι· τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς Θεὸς οἶδεν. ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία ὑπό τινων μὲν λεγόντων ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολήν, ὑπό τινων δέ, ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις."

nevertheless intend those words of doubt to be referred, not to this same convenient "somebody," but to the very subject upon which he has been expressing his own personal opinion in forcible terms. There is not a syllable to lead us to suppose that he is making a distinction between the judgment which he had formed upon critical grounds, and the judgment which he had formed upon grounds of historical tradition. He simply gives his opinion, founded, we presume, upon all that he knew of the Epistle itself, and of tradition concerning it; and he gives it as his opinion and nothing more, because confessedly the question was open till long after his time. On the other hand, he does make an unmistakable distinction between the thoughts and the words, and between the conceiver of the thoughts and the composer of the words. After he has in point of fact started with this distinction, there ought to be no great difficulty in permitting him to revert to it immediately after. And yet it is upon this imaginary difficulty that the one only argument against our interpretation is founded.

Alford thinks that in the clause, "who is the writer" (τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας), the word which we translate "writer" cannot possibly have that meaning as opposed to "author," because in the very same sentence it is used of S. Luke, who was author, as well as writer, of the Gospel and the Acts (Prolegom., § 21); in other words, we cannot consider the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews as separable from the author, unless we also agree to consider S. Luke the writer, as separable from S. Luke the author, of the Gospel and the Acts. Really no one need hesitate to accept the alternative with all its consequences. Even though S. Luke did originate, as well as write, the Gospel and the Acts, we have the most unfettered liberty to think of him under either point of view, or under both; and if we did choose to speak of him as a writer, without caring to make any statement about his authorship, we should have the most perfect right to do so, and in so doing we should probably use some form of the very word which is employed by Origen. Can I not say that the moon shines less brightly than the sun, without being understood to maintain that the moon shines by its own proper light? And yet "shines," when applied to the sun, might just as fairly be taken to include both ideas, of imparting and of originating light, as Origen's word, when applied to S. Luke, can be taken to include the two ideas of writing and originating a letter. Every one knows that S. Luke both wrote and originated what he wrote; and everybody knows that the sun both shines and originates its own sunshine. If then the natural meaning of the word in question is the actual writer, the reducer of thoughts into written language, without any necessary allusion to the prime source whence those thoughts were borrowed: if two sentences back Origen has drawn a distinction between

author and writer, recording his deliberate judgment about the former, and his complete uncertainty about the latter: if, moreover, that deliberate judgment is borne out by his constant practice; for with him, as with so many other Fathers, the rule holds good, that, while he is careful to commemorate the doubts of others, it does not seem to occur to him that he ought to doubt for himself: if, in fine, the complete uncertainty expressed by the words, "God, He knoweth," more naturally belongs to that other complete uncertainty expressed in the word "somebody else," than it belongs to that deliberate judgment here passed by Origen upon the apostolic authorship, confirmed as it is elsewhere by copious and confident citation; if all these things be so, why may not Origen have spoken of the writer as opposed to the author?

Origen never meant that only God knew who the author was; (1) because he never said it: (2) because his practice gives no support to such an idea: (3) because his successors in the Alexandrian Church, who took their cue from him, do not seem to have so understood him.

Origen and Clement differing, as they did, only on a minor point, and thoroughly agreed upon the great question of the Pauline authorship, were sure to influence their own disciples and their children's children, and we are glad to be able to defer so far to Dean Alford's judgment, as to admit the needlessness of quoting a long line of Alexandrian prelates, who without one dissentient voice received the Epistle to the Hebrews as S. Paul's.

And yet it would be too much to say that even all of these were merely blind and reckless followers of the arbitrary decision of any private doctor, however great. It is enough to say that the series includes the names of Athanasius, the Church's champion at Nicæa, and Cyril, who presided at Ephesus as the representative of Pope Celestine. S. Antony, too, the great patriarch of monks, was fond of the Epistle, and quotes it as S. Paul's. (Cf. Epp. XI., XVII., XVIII., &c.) So also S. Isaias, another Egyptian abbot (cf. Oratio XIII., &c.), and S. Macarius the Great, who quotes the Epistle very frequently, and sometimes calls it S. Paul's. (Cf. Hom. 49, § 4, &c.)

The Fathers of the Eastern Church, outside Alexandria and Egypt, must not be passed over so summarily. They have as good a right as any men that ever lived to be considered independent witnesses.

S. Gregory Thaumaturgus, first on the list, was, it is true, a friend and scholar of Origen, and as such might be suspected. He quotes the Epistle, and as S. Paul's, but he makes less use of it than does Origen's declared enemy, S. Methodius, Bishop of Tyre. (Cf. Convivium decem Virginum, Or. 5. c. 7.) This illustrious bishop suffered martyrdom about the year A.D. 312. He was, according to

S. Epiphanius (Hær., 64, § 63), a man of learning and remarkably zealous for the truth, and by S. Jerome he is spoken of (Comment. in Dan., c. 13) as "a most eloquent man and a martyr." Eusebius passes him by in silence, apparently in indignation at his attack upon Origen.

Eusebius (of Cæsarea) himself, who died in 340, albeit a great admirer of Origen, was too learned a man, and far too much of an original investigator, to receive his canon of Scripture at even a friend's dictation; and to say otherwise, is to do him grievous wrong. Besides, he agreed rather with Clement of Alexandria; than with Origen; for he considered the Greek a translation (H. E., iii. 38);* yet he did not agree altogether even with Clement, for he thought that S. Clement of Rome, not S. Luke, was the translator. We have only to open the commentaries of Eusebius at random to find his opinion. (Cf. *e.g.* in Ps. xli. 4–8, Ps. xlix. 2, Ps. xci. 2–3, Ps. xcii. 1, Ps. xciv. 8, Ps. xcviii. 9; De Eccles. Theologia, l. 3, c. 3, &c.)

S. James of Nisibis, in Mesopotamia, may speak for the Armenian Church. He was a contemporary of Eusebius. (Cf. *e.g.* Sermo VIII.)

Titus, Bishop of Bostra, in Arabia, who died before A.D. 378, is another witness. (Cf. Adversus Manichæos, l. iii. c. 4.) Both S. Jerome and Sozomen speak of his learning and eloquence. Sozomen (H.E., I. iii. c. 14) ranks him among the illustrious men of his time. Julian the Apostate honoured Titus with his personal enmity.

The other names we have to quote are too well known to require an introduction, even with those who have made no special study of Church history.

S. Basil the Great (ob. A.D. 379) quotes largely from the Epistle, and attributes it to S. Paul. (Cf. e.g. Ep. 38, § 6.)

S. Gregory of Nyssa, his brother, does the same. (Cf. de Virginitate, c. 22.)

S. Gregory of Nazianzum (ob. 389) says that this Epistle has the true "ring" about it.†

S. Cyril of Jerusalem (ob. 386) expressly says it is S. Paul's (Catech. xv. § 28).

S. Epiphanius, whose life stretched across almost a century, from A.D. 308 to A.D. 403, seems never to have doubted about the Pauline authorship. (Cf. *e.g.* Hær., 66, § 80.)

---

* Eusebius is not necessarily inconsistent in thinking (Comment. in Ps. ii. 7) that S. Paul, who commonly used the LXX., had the LXX. version in view when he wrote Heb. i. 5.

† τινὲς δέ φασι τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους νόθον,
οὐκ εὖ λέγοντες· γνησία γὰρ ἡ χάρις.

(Carm., l. 2, sec. ii. l. 308.)

S. Ephrem of Edessa, the Syrian, who died in the same year with S. Basil, is another valuable witness. (Cf. *e.g.* t. 2, Serm. in 2m Domini Adventum.)

Add to these Amphilochius (ob. circ. A.D. 392), who, alluding in a fragment to Heb. i. 14, ascribes it to the Apostle, and there will only remain unnoticed one of the stars of that great Oriental constellation which illumined the Church at the close of the fourth century.

That star which we reserve for special inspection is S. John Chrysostom. It would scarcely be an exaggeration to say that the ruling passion of his life was admiration of S. Paul. In season and out of season his eloquence is ever recurring to this loved theme. We have only to read the glowing words in his best-known work, De Sacerdotio (l. vi. c. 6), to assure ourselves of the depth of his love and reverence for the great Apostle. Love is blind, but only to the defects, not to the identity of the person beloved. S. Chrysostom, with his passionate devotion to S. Paul, had thrown himself into the study of his Epistles. He had tried to imbibe their spirit, and may well seem to have succeeded. Would not such a mind as his at once detect, and such a heart as his almost know by instinct, no matter how disguised, the genuine tones of that familiar voice? And would not the smallest misgiving about the authenticity have shown itself in his dealings with the suspected Epistle? Yet nowhere is there a trace of any disadvantageous comparison of the Epistle to the Hebrews with the other writings of the much-cherished master. Immediately after he has been lauding to the sky yet once again S. Paul and his Epistles, he takes the opportunity of noticing the reason which induced S. Paul to omit his name at the beginning of this Epistle. "The Epistles of Paul," he says, "are mines and well-springs of spiritual wealth:—mines, because they furnish us with treasure of higher price than any gold:—well-springs, because they never fail." Then he subjoins a little lower down: "Always when writing to others, he puts his name at the beginning of his Epistles, but he did nothing of the sort when he was writing to the Hebrews. Without writing any introduction, without saying who he was, or to whom he was writing, as it had been his wont to do, he started off at once with the words: God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke in times past to our fathers. This was prudence on Paul's part. In order that his letter might not share his own unpopularity, he hid himself under a kind of mask by suppressing his name, &c." S. John Chrysostom, therefore, so jealous of the honour of S. Paul, and so deeply versed in all that appertained to the Apostle and his writings, seems to have been utterly unmoved by all the suspicions, certainly not unknown to him, which had been long harboured in the Western Church. But by this time S. Ambrose had spoken out, and

S. Augustine was at work with all the influence of his great name to change controversy into unanimity; and this, be it observed, not by trying, Western, as he was, to reduce the East to acknowledge the justice of those ancient doubts of Rome, but by invoking the aid of an authoritative voice to silence those doubts, and to proclaim the truth of that numerously attested, and stoutly defended Oriental tradition. From this time we have nothing but unwavering consent in theory and in practice. Theodoret of Cyre, the well-known historian, begins the preface to his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews by severely rebuking the Arians for not receiving the Epistle as coming from S. Paul. We meet occasionally afterwards an historical notice of the doubts which had existed, but only by way of making it more clear that they existed no longer. There was only one mind in the Church about the Pauline origin of this Epistle from thenceforward till the time of Cajetan (ob. 1535) and Erasmus (ob. 1536). Cajetan was considered to have treated Scripture with far too great freedom, and, as he was not familiar with Hebrew, he was at the mercy of the Rabbi, to whom he went as to a fountain-head of sound interpretation of the Old Testament. He used the same liberty of private judgment in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, which from intrinsic reasons he deems not only not Pauline, but not even canonical. For this rash assertion he is properly taken to task by Ambrosius Catharinus, himself a bold and original thinker, and by many others. Estius and Bellarmine give some of his arguments against the canonicity; and if he had no better than these to bring, Cajetan richly deserved the abuse that he received.*

Erasmus, though such a friend and favourite of Protestantism, was content to leave the canonicity unassailed, but he expressed his decided opinion that S. Paul was not the author. He seems to have been chiefly influenced by the doubting mode of citation adopted by both S. Jerome and S. Augustine, and of course also by that unfortunate letter to Dardanus, which is well calculated to mystify any one, and which yet, as we have seen, cannot, unless we attribute to the writer either downright falsification of history or

---

* Here are two specimens (Bellarm. de Verbo Dei, l. i. c. 17). "Argumentum 6tum est Cajetani in commentario hujus epistolæ. Auctor hujus epistolæ probat cap. 1. Christum esse Filium Dei ex illis verbis libro 2. Reg. c. 7: *Ego ero illi in patrem:* et hæc verba intelliguntur ad literam de Salomone, et solum ex literali consensu sumuntur argumenta firma: igitur vel iste auctor non est Paulus, vel Paulus non solide argumentatur" * * *

"Argum. 7m ejusdem Cajetani est. Ad Heb. 9 dicit Auctor fuisse in arca urnam habentem manna et virgam Aaron, quæ fronduerat, et tabulas legis: sed l. 3. Regum, c. 8, solæ tabulæ referuntur fuisse in arca; igitur aut mentitur Paulus, aut hujus epistolæ auctor non est Paulus."

the most audacious and unfounded assertion, bear the meaning which Erasmus, Alford, and others wish to attach to it.

We have seen also how that hesitating style of citation is amply accounted for by the mere consciousness of the existence of great doubt on the subject. Still, though we cannot allow that Erasmus had sufficient reason for adopting even the milder half of Cajetan's *uncatholic* teaching, it is quite unnecessary to call him a heretic on the point. Even after the dogmatic decree of Trent, Estius, as we have said, would not call it more than "*temerarious*" to deny the authorship, as long as the canonicity was admitted.

We may sum up the history of the external evidence upon the authorship of our Epistle, by repeating that the most ancient testimonies quoted on the subject are purely negative. Those who could have spoken from their own personal knowledge either never transmitted what they knew, or the record has perished in the transmission. Had the early evidence been decisive, the controversy would never have arisen. The earliest positive evidence on the subject is at variance in the East and West. In the West there was a widespread and very real doubt about everything connected with the Epistle. In the East there was the consciousness of the existence of that doubt in the West, joined with a wonderful unanimity in refusing to sanction, or take home, the doubt. As time went on, the Easterns became more and more immovable in their opinion, and the Westerns, little by little, abandoned their doubts, and opened their minds to firm conviction and peaceful assurance.

It may not be amiss to remark, in passing, that ordinarily human minds proceed contrariwise. Objective truth alone, revealed or recognized, can change subjective doubt into subjective certainty; whilst, if a little time be granted, it is the easiest thing in life to shake mere human conviction, resting on an *ipse dixit* even of Origen.

There existed, then, in early times, at least in the Western Church, a most unmistakable doubt about the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It must now be our business to investigate the causes of this doubt, and to trace it back to its starting-point. Was it well founded? Was it so founded that scholars and critics, unbiassed by any infallible teaching, and free to pursue "intelligent inquiry," would be forced to confess that S. Paul had, at the best, but a very ambiguous claim to be regarded as the author? In other words, do Catholics hold the Pauline authorship just merely because they cannot help themselves, and have no liberty to think as they like in the matter, or are they well able to make out a good case for their opinion, and can they show that here, as elsewhere, reason and dogma are in harmony? When we try to investigate the origin of the doubt, we recognize at the outset

two evident, though perhaps only partial causes, one negative and one positive. Both have been already more than hinted at in the previous rapid historical sketch. The first is the insufficiency of primitive tradition; the second is the manifold discrepancy, which seems to sever at once and hopelessly this Epistle from the universally acknowledged thirteen of S. Paul. The total absence of primitive tradition would of course, by itself alone, have been cause enough of subsequent doubt; but we need not suppose that, in the early Church, there was the same total dearth of information that meets us now. The tradition might well have existed, and yet have been too weak to cope with the other strong and positive cause of doubt, the intrinsic difference of style. There might have been a strong leaning in the minds of the faithful to the idea of Pauline origin, but, for want of one single downright testimony to counteract the intrinsic evidence, such a tendency might be gradually weakened till it died away. This could not have been if S. Clement of Rome had only introduced one of his many quotations with the words: "The Vessel of Election speaketh." That, which in S. Jerome's letter to Dardanus has, by hypercritical interpreters, been construed into a conventionalism, could not have been so misunderstood in a letter written by the disciple of S. Paul himself. In fact, if S. Clement had adopted another method of quotation, there would have been one dispute the less in Christendom, and it would never have been given to mankind to know all the treasures of logic and research which a few plain words had forfeited; those intricate windings of German ingenuity, those evenly balanced arguments which left poor Michaelis where they found him, only with a more bewildering sense of hopelessness. The insufficiency of primitive tradition was only a negative cause. It was absolutely needed to give the other causes room to work, but we have no reason to suppose that it was complete enough to be itself the source of the doubt.

The other and positive cause which meets us on the threshold of our inquiry, is, as has been said, the manifold discrepancy between this Epistle and the others of S. Paul. The exordium is startlingly different: the phraseology is different, methodically and systematically different throughout: there are some expressions (ii. 3) which at first sight seem inconsistent with S. Paul's position and authority, so jealously vindicated in his other Epistles. Behold amply enough to create grave doubt in the minds of those who were not deeply convinced of S. Paul's authorship.

But it is not precisely with the doubt itself, nor yet precisely with the causes of the doubt, that we have to deal. We want to trace the operation of those causes, not for their own sake, or for anything to which they led, but simply in order to discover that previous certainty, which they succeeded in changing into doubt.

The doubt, as we find it established in the earliest direct testimony, is not the aboriginal state of the subject. At first it was certain, either that S. Paul wrote, or that S. Paul did not write, the letter. Now, from which of these contradictory certainties was the doubt, as we have it, evolved, and fashioned by the operation of the causes above specified? What was the "materia ex qua" of the later doubt, the raw material from which it was fashioned? This is the single point at issue.

The actual genesis of the doubt is well beyond the reach of our inquiry. Where all is hypothesis, we are, in reason, bound to take the more simple solution. We are not at liberty to take a less likely solution, merely because it is a possible way out of the difficulty, for that would be to effect an arbitrary and capricious, not a logical settlement of the dispute. Therefore the question narrows itself to this: is it more easy to suppose that some disciple of S. Paul wrote the letter, and that the master's name in course of time supplanted the scholar's; or to suppose that S. Paul wrote the letter himself, and that his authorship afterwards became doubtful? Alford and the modern Germans maintain the former alternative; we defend the latter.

To defend the former is to say, that the master's name was actually substituted for the disciple's, at least to a sufficient extent to start a doubt.

To defend the latter is to say, that some one was accused of substituting the master's name for the disciple's.

Therefore the question narrows itself still farther. Is it easier to suppose that some one changed the author, or to suppose that some one said that some one else had changed the author?

The question simplified into this form may be taken as answering itself, but it will be better to work out the argument. Our thesis, then, is this: that it is *much more easy* to account for the later doubt upon the hypothesis that S. Paul himself was the author of the Epistle, than upon the hypothesis which ascribes it to one of his disciples.

Those who contest S. Paul's claims consider nothing more easy than to suppose that the letter was written by a disciple of S. Paul, and that the lesser name, as time went on, was gradually merged in the greater, and so came ere long to be entirely lost. If they cared to prove this assertion, which they do not, I fancy their argument would probably run somewhat thus:—

Daily experience, they might say, is enough to show us how easy it is to father an anecdote, or a good saying, upon Sheridan, or Talleyrand; or a practical joke upon Theodore Hook; or a genuine bull upon Sir Boyle Roche. So, by parity of reasoning, nothing is more easy than to suppose that a letter of such merit as the Epistle to the Hebrews, going begging for an author in the early

Church, should come to be fathered upon S. Paul. Yes; but, then, before we proceed any farther, how came the letter to go begging for an author? It was not anonymous from the beginning, like the letters of Junius. Nobody seriously supposes that the author was unknown to his first readers and hearers. Then, how came he to be unknown to their descendants? It was known at first that S. Barnabas, we will say, wrote the letter, but his name was not down in black and white. All the first generation of Christians knew that the letter was his; therefore, also, all of the second generation, who cared to know it, knew it; and as long as any number of the faithful cared to know whose the letter was, it is not easy to see how they lost sight of S. Barnabas; and neither is it easy to understand how they could have taken a deep and universal interest in the subject-matter of the Epistle, and have shown at the same time a great and universal carelessness about its author.

There is this difference between witty sayings and bulls and anecdotes on the one hand, and letters on the other, that the story or joke has what excellence it has quite independently of, or with very faint reference to, its prime originator; whilst a letter and its writer are so bound up together that the writer's name may be said to be of the essence of the writing. Any letter which is worthy of the name; any letter which is not a mere string of unimpassioned syllogisms; any letter which, like our Epistle, is redolent of personal feeling and individuality, ought to be, and always will be, a reflex of the writer's mind—the words that his pen has traced are but his fugitive thoughts, caught and pinioned, and held firmly down. How often do we see in a picture some face full of meaning and character, which forces the conviction upon us that it is a likeness and not an ideal. Who can see such a picture, and know that it is a likeness, and catch the play of character that gives reality to those features, yet never care to inquire who is the original? A letter would be shorn of more than half its force if the receiver or possessor did not know whence it came, unless he knew at least this much, that the author was some great unknown determined to remain unknown. The more excellent the letter, the more anxious all would be to learn its author's name. This amply explains the anxiety shown in later times to discover, or to fix beyond dispute, the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews; but it makes it difficult, if not impossible, to admit, in the case of the early Christians, that indifference which the anti-Pauline hypothesis involves. If there had been from the beginning, as there must have been, the same solicitude about the author, how could his name have fallen through? Truly, if Barnabas, or Luke, or Silas, or Clement wrote the letter, this difficulty seems insuperable.

It is safer sometimes to put a question vaguely. Can anything be easier, we are asked, than to suppose that *somehow or other* the

lesser name got merged in the greater, and the moonlight was drowned in the sunshine? Can anything be easier? Yes, this is easier. It is easier to shake an existing tradition, than to set a new tradition in train. It is easier to pull down than to build up. It is easier to suggest doubts and suspicions than to spread positive information. If our opponents will have it that it is easy and natural to suppose that the epistle sent by S. Barnabas was *actually* fathered upon S. Paul, then it is at least more easy and more natural to suppose that some one threw out a hint that perhaps this had been done, that perhaps the Epistle believed to be S. Paul's had only been fathered upon him. Nothing more would be wanted. It would be as the spark to the powder. The intrinsic evidence of the letter itself would alone suffice to make such a suggestion plausible. The suspicion would gain wings at once, and with the non-Pauline Greek, and the non-Pauline exordium, and the manifold divergence from S. Paul's strongly-marked and well-known style, to add what would seem like proof positive to that which was but a surmise in reality, the wonder would be small indeed if many men gave in to the idea that some lesser name had in fact been merged in the greater name of Paul; for there is not a shadow of difficulty in saying this, or in thinking it, but all the whole difficulty lies in doing it.

Thus, taking the uncertainty about the authorship of the Epistle for an historical fact, we have a better right to solve it for S. Paul's authorship than against it, provided always the intrinsic evidence be not strong enough to force us from our position. It will be necessary to glance at the discrepancies several times alluded to already; for if they be, indeed, not only at first sight startling, as we have admitted, but on mature investigation incompatible with Pauline authorship, then the argument, which we have just been tracing out, loses all force at once, for it is confessedly built upon hypothesis, and hypothesis is powerless in the face of facts.

If, however, these startling discrepancies admit of a fair and natural solution, then have we the very state of things, the very set of circumstances which, had we been free to choose, we should have chosen, in order to bear out, to ratify, to clinch the hypothesis on which we have been building. I mean we have exactly what is required in order to account satisfactorily for the phenomena as we find them; and the very discrepancies themselves, instead of presenting any fresh difficulty, furnish us with the key to the whole question.

But if, furthermore, on sinking the shaft deeper, we find that the discrepancies are only surface-soil, and that all is good ore below; if we find, as we labour on, that the singularities of the Epistle seem to grow fewer and fainter, till they are altogether outnumbered and outweighed by the underlying solid evidence of Apostolic

agency which grows upon our notice evermore, we have herein not only another and a strong confirmation of our hypothesis, but an additional strong and independent proof of the Pauline authorship.

Of these discrepancies the first and most obvious is the absence of that opening salutation so characteristic of the Apostle, which is invariably present in the thirteen acknowledged Epistles:— Paul, the servant of Jesus Christ, called to the Apostolate, set apart for the Gospel of God; Paul, appointed Apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God; Paul, the Apostle, constituted not by men, nor through the mediation of man, but through Christ Jesus and God the Father; Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ according to the commandment of God our Preserver, and Jesus Christ our Hope; or, Paul, the servant of God and the Apostle of Jesus Christ; or, Paul the Prisoner of Christ Jesus; or, in the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, simply, Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus to the Church of the Thessalonians.

If the Epistle to the Hebrews had had the name of Paul for its opening word, though, no doubt, some keen critics would have looked upon it as a marginal note incorporated into the text, there would probably never have been sufficient controversy on the subject to compel us to devote this essay to its elucidation; but it is a fact calling for comment and explanation, that in this Epistle alone, of all that are ascribed to S. Paul, the name and its concomitants are alike missing from the title-page.

Of course, we might say that S. Paul had every right to make an exception if he liked to a rule of his own framing; and we cannot irresistibly infer that, because in thirteeen epistles he adopted one style of salutation, therefore he could not have indited a fourteenth with a perfectly unique commencement; but it is desirable to do something more than merely show that S. Paul's opponents cannot prove their point.

Clement of Alexandria accounts for the omission simply and satisfactorily. We have already heard his reason from S. John Chrysostom, who was sufficiently satisfied with it to make it his own.

He (Clement) remarks that it is natural that the name, "Paul the Apostle" does not occur at the beginning; for, when addressing the Hebrews, who were prejudiced and full of suspicion against him (S. Paul), he shows great judgment in not alienating their sympathies at the outset by the mention of his name.

Eusebius quotes Clement as follows:—

(Eus. H. E., l. 6, c. 14):— *μὴ προγεγράφθαι δὲ τὸ*, Παῦλος *ἀπόστολος εἰκότως Εβραίοις γάρ φησιν ἐπιστέλλων, πρόληψιν εἰληφόσι κατ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑποπτεύουσιν αὐτὸν, συνετῶς πάνυ οὐκ ἐν ἀρχῇ ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτοὺς τὸ ὄνομα θείς.*

This seems likely enough. Clement thinks that S. Paul acted sensibly (συνετῶς) in dropping his name, and it is a pleasure to agree with Clement. S. Paul, it is quite certain, was no favourite with the Jerusalem Jews, and might easily wish to avoid causing irritation by prematurely parading an unwelcome name. He might like to give his arguments every chance of sinking in before he made any allusion to himself. When once the desired impression had been produced, any animosity which might survive the softening influence of his glowing words, would be comparatively harmless. This idea, thrown out by Clement of Alexandria, is in perfect harmony with the tone of the entire Epistle, which, though there runs through it an indefinable grandeur, and a something that tells of real authority, is yet strikingly conciliatory and unassuming. In this it differs very widely from the Epistle to the Romans. That was almost fierce in its denunciations. This is, as he calls it himself (xiii. 22), a "verbum solatii." "And I beseech you, brethren, that you suffer this word of consolation. For I have written to you in a few words." That is, few words if compared with all he had to say. From this verse some have deduced that the Epistle to the Hebrews was meant to be rather a treatise than an epistle properly so called; but, if this be said of the Hebrews, then the same will have to be said of the Romans; for, in general arrangement, length, and proportion of parts, these two Epistles are as similar as they are unlike in tone and style.

The words which follow those just quoted sound Paul-like enough:—"Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty: with whom (if he come shortly) I will see you." "Salute all your prelates and all the saints. The brethren from Italy salute you, Grace be with you all. Amen."

There is a difficulty, founded on ii. 3, of which Erasmus and Cajetan make very much, but which we may justly consider extremely frivolous. The verse runs thus:—"How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation? which, having begun to be declared by the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard Him."

How could S. Paul, it is asked, have dreamed of including himself in this way among those to whom the tidings of salvation had been confirmed by others who had heard them? If there is one thing about which he is properly jealous, it is to insist upon the directness of his Divine Commission. Hear him addressing the Galatians (i. 11, 12):—"For I give you to understand, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached by me is not according to man: for neither did I receive it of man, nor did I learn it; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

We are asked if one and the same man could write both these

passages consistently. No figure of speech, it is urged, no oratorical confounding of the speaker with his audience, will account for such discrepancies as this. But there is a very simple reply. We may explain the words how we like, but here is the fact. Whether these words can or cannot contain such a figure of speech, there can be no reasonable doubt that they do in fact contain it, as any one, by referring two verses back, may prove to his own satisfaction. The writer of the Epistle is constantly throughout this part identifying himself with his hearers:—"Therefore ought we more diligently to observe the things which we have heard, lest perhaps we should let them slip. For if . . . . how shall we escape," &c.

Add to this that the obnoxious "unto us" may be explained without any violence in the sense of "down to our times"; and then consider, too, that words which could find no place where he is asserting his authority, as in Romans and Galatians, or even where he is speaking on indifferent subjects, may neverthless very well find room in the second chapter of an epistle in which, if it may be so expressed, he sinks his apostleship at starting, and lets it peep out only gradually and modestly afterwards. The Doctor of the Gentiles, who, in his thirst for souls and his readiness to make himself all things to all men, submitted to defunct ceremonies, having his head shaved, and comporting himself as a Nazarite, to conciliate, at the request of S. James (Acts xxi.), the Jewish converts in Jerusalem, was not the man to shrink from such an innocent turn of rhetoric as this identification of orator and audience must be allowed to be. S. Augustine, who fought so long and well, and carried his point, that S. Peter at Antioch must have been in some way "reprehensibilis," or Holy Scripture could never have said that he was, found nothing to offend his nice sense of the truthfulness of inspired writing in this second chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and certainly he ascribed this "figure of speech" to none other than S. Paul.

It remains that we assign a sufficient reason for the great diversity of style and diction, which marks off this letter from the uncontroverted thirteen. That there is this diversity is obvious to even a casual reader of the Greek. It is not a phrase here and there, or the turn of a sentence only, but it is an all-pervading difference of style. It will not be necessary to prove an assertion which nobody cares to contest. We have seen what Origen says on the subject, and he is a better judge on such a point than perhaps any mortal man can ever be again: and from Origen's days to the present time there has been but one opinion, that any one capable of forming an opinion is sure to detect a wide difference between this Epistle and the others of S. Paul. The words are different, the constructions are different, the eloquence itself is

of a different type. Even Professor Hug* admits the difference, though he is content to ascribe it to the effects of the course of education to which the Apostle had been subjected.

"Having been (we quote the Professor) for a long time led about from one tribunal to another, and having been obliged to be his own advocate and speaker, he perfected himself in a fluency which was ready to be applied to the first occasion." (Supplement, section 142.) And again: "The more I become acquainted with the writings of the Apostle, the more am I tempted to account the Epistle to the Hebrews as his masterpiece. It bears the seal of perfection, just as those to the Thessalonians denote the commencement of his career as an author." (*Ib.* section 143.)

The Greek cannot be from S. Paul's hand. Are we to say that it is a translation from a Hebrew original? Clement of Alexandria thought that it was; but Origen had sound reasons for abandoning his master's opinion. We venture to think that it is almost as evident that the Greek is no translation, as that the Greek is not S. Paul's own. Much stress has generally been laid on the apparent use of the Septuagint by the original author; but, although this argument is not without weight, it is yet by no means so conclusive as many have wished to consider it. It is argued that the very point of difference between the Hebrew and the Septuagint enters more than once into the argument itself, so that to abandon the reading is to destroy the reasoning. If this were accurately true, it would be almost conclusive as to the language in which the Epistle was written; for it is not likely that the writer would desert the original Hebrew and conform to the LXX., if he were writing the letter in Hebrew.

But, on examining the passages adduced as examples (especially x. 5—10 and 38, 39), it will be found that, though the LXX. reading seems to improve the force of the passage, it is yet by no means essential to the logical inference. A proof, however, which by itself does not suffice, may often help to build up a conclusive argument; and if the manner in which the quotations from the LXX. are handled in this Epistle does not absolutely prove that the original language was Greek, it is at least a valuable confirmation of other proofs, which are not wanting.

Many of the peculiarities of style which make this Epistle so unlike the other thirteen of S. Paul, seem also to declare that it is no translation. The Greek is too elegant, the rounding of the periods is too graceful; the flow of the sentences is too natural to suggest to any mind that it is a reproduction from a widely

* An Introduction to the Writings of the New Testament, by Dr. John Leonard Hug. Translated by the Rev. Daniel Guildford Wait, LL.D. London. 1827.

different idiom. Then, again, there are many long compound words whch exactly suit the genius of the Greek, and seem to be the direct exponents of original compound thoughts, but which we can hardly bring ourselves to regard as ingenious condensations of much longer and more unwieldy expressions in the original. Some of these beautiful inventions of a mind deeply Grecian in its literary habits could not be rendered in any other language without heart-rending circumlocution; and if that other language were the stiff and uncompromising, though strong and beautiful, Hebrew, in which, for mere want of adjectives, very simple ideas often require to be eked out with a combination of substantives, we may be allowed to believe that the task of retranslation would have been too severe for even holy David's unassisted powers. If the Epistle be indeed a translation from Hebrew into Greek, it is one in which the translator has had large license to modify and invent; and if the limits of what is meant by translation be indefinitely stretched till they admit the freest paraphrase of the thoughts of another, then Clement of Alexandria's opinion may be explained away till it coincides with Origen's.

But now, if the Greek of this Epistle is neither a translation in any strict sense of the word, nor the writing of S. Paul, we must admit one of two things—either that S. Paul was not the author or that it is possible to effect a divorce between the author and the writer. If we take the latter course, we have Cornelius a Lapide against us.

Some (he says), including Origen and Clement of Alexandria,* quoted above, make answer that it was written in Greek, after such a manner that the ideas and the subject matter belong to Paul, but the wording and the composition to S. Luke, or to Clement, and that for this reason it is more elegant than the other epistles of Paul. In this case, however, Paul would not be the author and sacred writer of this epistle, but much rather Luke, or Clement, the man, in fact, who wrote down and put in order the various ideas, not by his own caprice, but by the inspiration of God, and under the dictation of the Holy Ghost.

A Lapide in this remark forgets himself. To say that the actual writer, the framer of the words and sentences, has the best right to be considered the author, is to make the raiment more than the body, or the body more than the soul. When we pass from the words, and the syntax, and the flow of language, to the examination of the thoughts and the arguments, and the treatment of the subject, we find S. Paul and the spirit of S. Paul living and moving in every verse. There is only one Paul, in his

* This is a slip of the pen. Indeed, A Lapide contradicts it in the very next paragraph.

intense individuality, in the Church of God; but there must needs have been two Pauls if any other than the Doctor of the Gentiles conceived the Epistle to the Hebrews. Either S. Paul or his "alter ego" gave existence to the letter; but that "alter ego" never trod this earth.

Difficulties seem to hem our subject round. If we are to go by first appearances, and to form our judgment from externals, we shall say that the Epistle to the Hebrews is from any other hand than S. Paul's; but, whilst we are thus avoiding one difficulty, and shrinking in despair from the attempt to reconcile discordant language and divergent style, we find that we are only entangling ourselves more inextricably still in the meshes of a more unmanageable net. S. Paul did not think in the same groove as other men: and to read a letter which is made up of his thoughts, all arranged after his own way of thinking, and deny his authorship, is something like denying the Creator in His own creation, only because His name is not written in gold upon the azure sky.

At the Robber-Council of Ephesus the Eutychians cried out in their gentle and conciliatory way: Who cleaveth Christ, cleave him in twain! Cursed be he that severeth!* They were lamentably wrong in their notions of what was and what was not divisible; but he who divides what is really indivisible deserves the anathema of sensible men. Therefere we will not divide S. Paul from himself as long as there is an alternative left us.

We are free to assert that the Greek as we have it is the original text; that it is not from the hand of S. Paul, nor yet a translation from the Hebrew of S. Paul; and that for all that S. Paul is verily the author of the Epistle. With all deference to A Lapide, his judgment must be set aside in this matter. Without diving into the lowest depths of the doctrine of inspiration, or committing ourselves to any theory, it is enough to know that the Church by no means insists upon strict verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture, but lends her entire approval to theologians who uphold the "formal inspiration," accompanied by the "material assistance," of the Holy Ghost: who maintain, in other words, that the substance of what is said is Divine, but that the manner of saying it is left to the discretion of the inspired writer. He must be preserved from the possibility of error in the thing revealed, but he is free to adopt these words or those, this form of sentence or that, one figure of speech or another, even Anacoluthon included. The gift of inspiration does not necessarily involve high literary excellence; and, indeed, if it did, it could not stop short of the very highest perfection; and not only should we find, as now, a beauti-

* τὸν λέγοντα δύο φύσεις εἰς δύο τέμνε. ἀνάθεμα τῷ διαιροῦντι. (Labbe, t. 4, pp. 917, 918.)

ful admixture of sublime and simple, but the more we scrutinized each word and phrase, the more we should discover that the matchless beauty of the whole was due to the faultless, though varied, beauty of each several part, and there would certainly be no room for the modest excuses which close the Second Book of Machabees: "Which if I have done well, and as it becometh the history, it is what I desired: but if not so perfectly, it must be pardoned me."

If, then, S. Paul, either for want of leisure time, or simply because he wished to present his ideas clothed in more classic Greek, had taken one of his companions, a man deeply imbued with Christian doctrine, familiar with the Apostle's habit of mind, and train of thought, and method of reasoning, and had deputed him to draw up a little treatise in his most telling Greek, sketching out the kind of thing wanted, the divisions of the subject, the run of the argument, the various proofs, the plan of attack and defence, the tone of the address, the mode of blending all together, the arrangement and proportion of exhortation and instruction, the transition from dogmatic principles to practical application, with other items of detail; and if, after the skilful amanuensis had reduced these spoken hints into written Greek (*ὡσπερεὶ σχολιογραφήσας τὰ εἰρημένα τοῦ διδασκάλου*), S. Paul carefully examined the work, revised and corrected it, retrenching, or expanding, or improving when he met anything that was not exactly what his inspiration recognized as its own legitimate expression, and if, after assuring himself that it was a faithful embodiment of what he had in his own mind, he formally adopted and endorsed it, and sent it out under the sanction of his authority, who shall tell us that Barnabas, or Luke, or Silas, or Clement had a better right than Paul to be considered the author of that Epistle? S. Paul might have helped the writer in all the ways above specified, and the difficulty of supposing him to have taken so much trouble, and to have descended so scrupulously into detail, would be far less than the difficulties which have to be solved by those who say that S. Paul wrote the actual Greek, or by those who deny that S. Paul had anything at all to do with the letter.

Still, it is not necessary to suppose that S. Paul did quite everything that has been enumerated. He may have done considerably less, and still have been deservedly considered the author; for even so the matter is S. Paul's, the manner belongs to some one else. The words may be Luke's or Clement's, but the thoughts are the thoughts of Paul beyond the power of rhetoric to hide them. The soul is there and the body is there—it is but the garb which is changed.

This is the solution of the question given by Estius, and by Origen too, whatever Dean Alford may think. It seems complete and satisfactory, and reconciles the contending difficulties arising

from the contradictory character of the spirit and the letter in this Epistle to the Hebrews,—difficulties which seem incapable of simultaneous solution, because just in proportion as the one grows less the other gains importance, and to answer the one is to declare the other unanswerable. These difficulties now only do not vanish, because they have literally no existence. The language and the argument of the Epistle cease to be at variance the moment we are permitted to ascribe the one to S. Paul, without ascribing to him the other also. The Council of Trent tells us that S. Paul is the author. The author, in some true sense, S. Paul must be: this is, for us at least, out of the reach of dispute. We could not deny it if we wished; but no argument has been yet put forward that need distantly tempt us to deny it; and the deeper the insight we obtain by study into the inner meaning and spirit of the Epistle, the more our human judgment bears out the divinely assisted judgment of the Church, and forces upon us the conviction that S. Paul had the largest part in the production of the said Epistle. On the other hand, critics and scholars agree that the Greek is not S. Paul's, and is not a translation. There is one way out of the difficulty — easy, satisfactory, and orthodox— τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ Ἀποστόλου ἐστίν. "If I were to give my opinion," says Origen once again, "I should say that the thoughts are the Apostle's, but that the wording and construction are the work of some one else."

Art. IV.—MEMOIRS OF MADAME DE LAFAYETTE AND MADAME DE MONTAGU.

Vie de Madame de Lafayette. Par Madame de Lasteyrie, sa fille, et précédée d'une Notice sur la Mère Madame la Duchesse d'Ayen, 1737–1807. Paris: Léon Techener Fils.

Anne Paule Dominique de Noailles, Marquise de Montagu. Quatrième édition. Paris: Dentu.

A NOTICEABLE reaction in the way of sympathy has taken place within the last few years in France towards the elder branch of the Bourbons, and the faithful adherents who suffered for and with them in the terrible days of the First Revolution, a sympathy which is, we believe, unconnected with political hopes or plans, and which is felt by many who are content to

honour, as the powers that be, the representatives of the first Napoleon. It is said that the present Emperor in no way discourages it, and that he augurs no danger to his dynasty from the frequent appearance of the portraits of Marie Antoinette and her fair-haired boy, side by side with those of his Empress and the Prince Imperial. Be this as it may, and apart from all theories of legitimacy, it is a sign of grace and hope for France, that her eyes have so far recovered from the glare of revolutionary conflagration and military glory, as to look with pity and reverence, and perhaps with something of remorseful regret, upon the sufferings and the sufferers of those days of preternatural wickedness and of supernatural goodness.

Among the memoirs which have lately illustrated the period of the Revolution, the two works named at the head of this article have a special interest. The life of Madame de Lafayette, with a notice of her mother, the Duchess d'Ayen, is now published for the first time, though portions of the latter had already appeared in the beautiful memoir of Madame de Montagu. Taken together, the two volumes give us not only the portraits of three most remarkable and admirable women, but a life-like family group, which brings us at once into the centre of the old French society of the last century, which, with its good and its evil, was swept away for ever with the ancient monarchy of France. Almost all the members of the family of Noailles, one of the most illustrious among the court nobility, were, on the eve of the French Revolution, more or less affected by the fervour for liberty, and for the general reformation of abuses, which, to their credit, was as enthusiastically felt by the privileged classes, who had personally everything to lose, as by the *roturiers*, who had everything to gain by the change, and nothing (in Burke's words) to sacrifice but their shoe-buckles—* the obscure provincial advocates, country attorneys and notaries, by whom the *Tiers état* was chiefly represented in the assembly of the States General.

"It is not generally known," says the biographer of Madame de Montagu, "with what earnestness and good faith the nobility—and not only the provincial nobility, but even many of the magnates of the Court—had embraced the idea of a general reformation of the State, and hailed the approach of political liberty." This was proved by the part taken by the nobility in all the measures preparatory to the convocation of the States General. In the various documents then drawn up

* One of the harmless affectations of the early Republicans was to appear at court with shoe-strings instead of buckles. Hence :—

"Roland the just, with ribbons in his shoes."—*Anti-Jacobin.*

by them, we find the assertion of all the civil and political rights which the Republicans afterwards boasted to have wrested from them, and in a far fuller and more perfect form than that in which the Revolution left them after its career of horrors. They had, in fact, left little or nothing to the invention of modern Liberals. They had laid down all the great principles of representative government: a national representation by election; the equal division of taxes among all citizens; the fixed and periodical assemblage of the States General, to which, with the sanction of the king, was reserved the right of legislation; the responsibility of ministers; the liberty and security of individuals; the inviolability of property; liberty of commerce, labour, and industry; liberty of the press; the abolition of *lettres de cachet:* all these things, and much more in the same spirit, were claimed by the nobility and clergy no less than by the Tiers Etat.

If well employed, these elements would have sufficed to found a free government in France like that of England. . . . The Revolution wrecked this great reform, which would have been so easily effected under a king like Louis XVI.; its breath raised the tempest, the hand of the helmsman failed, and the vessel perished.

Unhappily, together with these enlightened and patriotic political views, too many of the higher as well as of the middle class had become deeply imbued with the *soi-disant* philosophy which Voltaire and other disciples of Bolingbroke had imported second-hand from England. The prevalent *Anglomania* was not only for round hats, high-trotting horses,* and constitutional governments, but for religious, or rather irreligious theories, which bore in reality as little resemblance to the then prevalent English Protestantism of Burke and George III. as the squalid *sans culottism of* Marat to the decent Whiggery of Somers.

The Count de Ségur† thus describes the opinions of the young French nobles, which he himself at the time shared:—

---

* "A courtier," says Sir Walter Scott, in his 'Life of Napoleon,' "deeply infected with the fashion of the time, was riding beside the king's carriage at a full trot, without observing that his horse's heels threw the mud into the royal vehicle. '*Vous me crottez, monsieur,*' said the king. The horseman, considering the words were *vous trottez,* and that the prince complimented his equestrian performance, answered, '*Oui, Sire, à l'Anglaise.*' The good-humoured monarch drew up the glass, and only said to the gentleman in the carriage, '*Voilà une Anglomanie bien forte.*' Alas! the unhappy prince lived to see the example of England, in her most dismal period, followed to a much more formidable extent.

† He married a younger sister of the Duchess d'Ayen.

Impeded in this light career by the antiquated pride of the old Court, the irksome etiquette of the old order of things, the severity of the old clergy, the aversion of our parents to our new fashions and our costumes, which were favourable to the principles of equality, we felt disposed to adopt with enthusiasm the philosophical doctrines professed by literary men, remarkable for their boldness and their wit. Voltaire seduced our imagination; Rousseau touched our hearts; we felt a secret pleasure in seeing that their attacks were directed against an old fabric, which presented to us a Gothic and ridiculous appearance. We were thus pleased at this petty war, although it was undermining our own rank and privileges and the remains of our ancient power; but we felt not these attacks personally, we merely witnessed them. It was as yet but a war of words and paper, which did not appear to us to threaten the superiority of existence we enjoyed, consolidated as we thought it by a possession of many centuries. . . . We were pleased with the courage of liberty, whatever language it assumed, and with the convenience of equality. There is a satisfaction in descending from a high rank, as long as the resumption of it is thought to be free and unobstructed; and regardless, therefore, of consequences, we enjoyed our patrician advantages, together with the sweets of plebeian philosophy.

It is evident, although rather implied than asserted by the dutiful children and grandchildren to whom we owe the memoirs before us, that the Duke d'Ayen, the head of the family of Noailles, had tasted of this poisoned chalice. He was an approved soldier and a brilliant man of the world, distinguished by a talent for conversation inherited from his grandfather, the old Maréchal de Noailles—science, literature, agriculture, philosophy, the business of the court and the camp, were alike familiar to him. He was, in fact, the very typical man of that gay and graceful French world of the eighteenth century, which was then fast drifting to so unlooked-for and tragical a conclusion. Like many others of his class, he possessed higher and nobler qualities than those which glittered on the surface. In inflexible truthfulness and integrity he was not surpassed even by his pious and scrupulously conscientious wife. "The idea," says Madame de Lafayette, "of regulating life by principles of duty, abstracting from all self-interest, had been rendered so habitual to us, not only by my mother's instructions, but by her daily and hourly example, as well as by that of my father on the occasions, unhappily too rare, when we were able to study it closely, that the first instances which we met with of an opposite conduct in those who are commonly called *honest people*, excited a surprise which it took many years passed in the world to weaken." Yet, though deeply attached to her husband, and although on great occasions he never failed to manifest his affection and esteem for her, Madame d'Ayen

could scarcely be accounted a happy wife. The Duke lived little at home. "Perhaps," says her daughter, "my mother, in her early youth, had suffered the superiority of her mind to appear too plainly to be pleasing to a young man." (She was two years older than the Duke, who had married at sixteen.) "Perhaps she had taken too little pains to please him; at least, she accused herself of having erred in this respect. It is certain that in the details of life she could never sufficiently overcome her natural indecision; and my father, attributing this to scrupulosity, took less pleasure in her society than would have been for his happiness and ours." This coldness on the part of her husband served, no doubt, to turn the full tide of her deep and strong affections upon her children, by whom it was devotedly and enthusiastically returned. "God had formed her before all things to be a mother." So wrote Madame de Lafayette, in the touching notice of her life, the writing of which beguiled the weary hours of captivity which she shared with her husband at Olmutz.* "We were," she continues, "the objects of the tenderest affection of her heart, and our training the first of her duties. To this lively impulse of the most motherly heart which God ever made, was joined the deeply-rooted intention to do the will of God, and to accomplish His work, so that she might be able one day to say to Him, after the example of our Lord,—'Of those whom Thou hast given to me I have lost none.' Everything was devoted to us; all her faculties were applied to our good and to our happiness; her solicitude and her foresight to turn aside everything which might injure us; her penetration to discern our characters, in order to direct each in the way most suited to it; the uprightness and strength of her mind to remove all frivolities from our education, and to accustom us, from our very childhood, to reason clearly and justly; her exceeding tenderness to cement our mutual union; and, lastly, her sweet eloquence, strengthened by her example, to teach us Christian virtue, with its principle, its aids, and its rewards."

The Duchess d'Ayen was the granddaughter of the celebrated Chancellor d'Aguesseau. Her mother having died a few days after her birth, she was sent at three years old to the Convent of the Visitation, at S. Denis, to be trained under the gentle yet firm discipline by which the daughters of S. Jane Frances de Chantal formed so many children of the nobility of France for a life of perfection, either in the world or in the cloister,—

* It was written with a toothpick and a morsel of Indian ink on the margin of a copy of Buffon; pen, ink, and paper, as well as knives and forks, being denied to the captives by the vigilance of the Austrian authorities.

a life which so many of her contemporaries consummated, like herself, on the scaffold.

From her earliest childhood (says Madame de Lafayette) my mother attached herself to the teaching of her holy instructresses with that uprightness and energy which were her distinctive characteristics, so that, with an uncertain, although superior mind, with a great physical and moral propensity to be disturbed and troubled under various circumstances, it was always manifest that this trouble and disquietude related only to the one object which pervaded her mind. "My heart," she might have said, "has never had any other fear than to offend against Thy law." Such, O my God, were the dispositions of my mother's heart, Thou didst form them within her, Thou hast crowned them, and that eternal justice which is none other than Thyself, now fills all the desires of her heart according to that promise of our Lord, "Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after justice, for they shall be filled."

At fourteen Mademoiselle d'Aguesseau left the convent for her father's house, which was ordered with almost conventual regularity, and at eighteen she was married to the Duke d'Ayen, who became afterwards, by the death of the Maréchal, his father, Duke de Noailles. The death of her first child, a boy, was followed by the successive births of five daughters. A son, as it may be easily supposed, was earnestly desired, to wear and transmit the honours of this almost princely house. The boon was at last granted, which seemed to fill up the only void in its prosperity. But the mother's heart trembled at the dangers which must beset her frail treasure in the world, and with the heroism of a martyr, she offered him without reserve to God. On Holy Thursday, when she returned from praying at the Sepulchre, she said to a friend: "I have just killed my son, and I am a little afraid for my daughters. If any of my children should fall ill, I shall be very much afraid. I have offered them all to God, that He may restore them all to me for eternity. I hope, however, that He will leave me my girls; but I think that He has accepted my boy, and that I shall not keep him long." So deep was this impression, that when the child fell sick of a lingering illness, she never indulged a moment's hope. When he was in his agony, as she held him clasped tightly in her arms, she said to him, from the very depths of her mother's heart,—"You have gained the victory; my child, nothing can now part us or separate us for eternity."

To the five daughters who remained, Madame d'Ayen devoted the remaining years of her life. Though they had other teachers, she herself superintended their education.

They came to her (says Madame de Montagu) the first thing in

the morning, met her when she was going to hear mass at the Jacobins or at S. Roch ; they dined with her at three o'clock, and afterwards she took them into her bedchamber. It was a great room, hung with crimson damask bordered with gold, with an immense bed. The duchess sat in her arm-chair near the fire, with her snuff-box, her books, and her needles close by her ; her five daughters grouped themselves around her, the elder ones on chairs, the little ones on stools, disputing lovingly which should get nearest to her. They talked of the lessons of yesterday and the little events of the day. It was not like a lesson, yet it was one, and a lesson better remembered than any other. . . . What eternal thanks are due from her daughters for having been brought by the prayers and instructions of such a mother to the happiness of knowing, serving, and loving God. "Non fecit taliter omni nationi."

There were peculiarities in Madame d'Ayen's mode of training which might have seemed of rather doubtful expediency, had they not been so fully justified by the result. She would point out to her children, as a warning, errors of judgment and mistakes in conduct into which she had herself fallen ; nor was she ever satisfied till she had convinced their reason as well as secured their obedience. She one day observed that, in consequence, they were far less docile than other children. "That may very well be, mamma," replied Madame de Lafayette, one of the most independent of the party, "because you allow us to make objections and to reason with you ; but you will see that at fifteen we shall be more, far more, docile than other girls." And so it came to pass ; for we find her, in the last quiet days which she enjoyed before the storm desolated the happy and stately home, surrounded by her daughters, their husbands and children—all, spite of the political differences which divided some of her sons-in-law, forming one harmonious circle, of which the hotel de Noailles was the centre. Her youngest daughter, Madame de Grammont, who perhaps resembled her most closely in the fervour of her piety and her singular unworldliness of spirit, and who was married to a husband like-minded with herself, resided with her at the hotel de Noailles. The fourth, Madame de Montagu, also singularly happy in the affection of her excellent husband and his family, was separated only by the distance of a street from her maternal home, of which she still continued to be the joy and the ornament. Madame de Thésan, the third, had nearly reached the close of her short and holy life. She was snatched away in the course of the year of which we are now writing, 1788. "Her second daughter (it is Madame de Lafayette herself who writes), whose troubles" (on account of her husband's absence in the American war) "had long been an anxiety to her, was now almost as happy a mother as she was a happy wife. . . . This second daughter,

whose fatiguiug activity was often inconvenient, was also able to be of use to my mother in the many cares which devolved upon her." Lastly, "Madame de Noailles, her eldest daughter (married to her cousin, the Viscount de Noailles), notwithstanding her deep and tender attachment to her husband, was able to give my mother all the care and dutiful attention which made her the repose of that anxious spirit by the clearness and calmness of her own, and the joy of her life by the exceeding sensibility of her heart. She was the unfailing resource of all her family, by whom she was especially beloved."

The Viscount de Noailles fully participated in the political views of his celebrated brother-in-law and companion in arms, the Marquis de Lafayette, who was then in the zenith of his popularity, having brought back from his American campaigns military glory enough to intoxicate his fellow-countrymen, and republican enthusiasm enough to turn their heads and his own. "All," says M. de Ségur, in his memoirs, "who lived in those days still remember the enthusiasm excited by the return of M. de Lafayette, an enthusiasm in which the queen herself partook. A splendid fête was given to celebrate the birth of the heir to the throne. Information reached the palace of the arrival of the conqueror of Cornwallis, and Madame de Lafayette, who was present, received a very signal mark of royal favour, for the queen insisted on taking her in her own carriage to the hotel de Noailles, where her husband had just arrived." Such was the fervour then excited by him whom Carlyle describes as the "constitutional pedant, clear, thin, inflexible as water turned to thin ice, whom no queen's heart can love." His influence, and that of M. de Noailles, was great with their young brothers-in-law, with the exception of the Marquis de Montagu, the noblest character presented to us in these memoirs, who withstood to the utmost of his power the visionary theories of the one party, and the hot haste with which too many of the other left their country to its fate, in the vain hope of bringing it to reason by the edge of a foreign sword.

All, however, was yet at peace. "Never," says Madame de Staël, who filled a foremost place in it, "was any society at once so brilliant and so much in earnest as that of Paris, during the three years from 1788 to 1791." "The enthusiasm," says another eyewitness,* "went to the length of blindness; lively imaginations flattered themselves with the hope of seeing the finest chimeras realized, or deprived themselves joyfully of privileges which they considered abuses, thinking in their

* Vie de la Princesse de Paix. Par la Vicomtesse de Noailles.

simplicity thus to rise to a moral height which the masses would have the generosity to understand or respect. In short, like the astrologer in the fable, they fell into a well while gazing at the stars."

Madame d'Ayen was far from dreading any curtailment of the state and privileges of her rank: her love of poverty was more than republican, it was religious. Not a personal indulgence did she ever allow herself; all which was not strictly required by the duties of her position was devoted to the poor. Her first trouble in early life was the inheritance of her grandfather's large fortune. She ever looked upon riches, and the responsibility attending them, as a heavy and most unwelcome burden, and the only serious breach which she ever had with her husband related to the marriage of Madame de Lafayette, which she long opposed, simply on account of the great wealth and influential position of the proposed bridegroom, which she feared would prove dangerous to a youth of sixteen, left his own master at so early an age. But, without a shadow of selfish or class interest, she trembled at the storm which began to threaten all that she held dearest and most sacred, and to disturb even the harmony of her home circle. In the autumn of 1791, Madame d'Ayen saw for the last time her two daughters, Mesdames de Montagu and de Lafayette, at their country homes. After the king's acceptance of the constitution, M. de Lafayette resigned the command of the national guard, and retired, Cincinnatus-like, to his country house at Chavaniac (Haute-Loire), exceedingly well satisfied both with the constitution and himself. His wife was delighted, believing that, as he told her, the revolution was finished, and that they were to grow old together at Chavaniac, busied in rustic labours, with no other cares than those of the peasants around them. "I enjoy," wrote the ci-devant general to a friend, "as a lover of liberty and equality, the change which has placed all citizens on the same level, and which respects none but legal authorities. I cannot tell you with what delight I bow before a village mayor." His triumphal journey, impeded by popular ovations, led him through Auvergne, where Madame de Montagu was then lingering at Plauzat, a château of her father-in-law, M. de Beaune, making preparations to accompany her husband in his late and reluctant emigration to England. Madame de Lafayette wrote full of joy to her sister, to tell her that she and M. de Lafayette would stop at Plauzat, that they might rejoice together over the happy issue of public affairs. Madame de Montagu shed over this letter the bitter tears which we weep over the delusions of those we love. So far was the revolution from being at an end, that she trembled at the very idea of the

proposed visit. M. de Beaune was so ardent a royalist, and so highly incensed at the results of M. de Lafayette's political experiments, that he was likely, even in exile, to close his doors against her, should he hear that she had received him at Plauzat. Sadly, therefore, she wrote to her sister to appoint a meeting at a little wayside inn, where the two sisters bade a sad and hasty adieu to each other.

Madame d'Ayen soon afterwards arrived at Plauzat, where she spent a fortnight, long afterwards remembered by her daughter, who throughout the time never found courage to tell her of her approaching emigration. "It was then," says Madame de Lafayette, "that my sister received her last lessons and treasured up her last example, and my mother, when she parted from her, unconscious that it was on the threshold of eternity, carried with her the unspeakable consolation which she received from the sight of the gifts of God to her child."

From Plauzat Madame d'Ayen proceeded to Chavaniac, and thence to Paris.

Meanwhile the revolution pursued its course, and each fresh step brought new danger and anxiety to the family of Noailles. On the fearful 20th of June, the venerable Maréchal de Mouchy, the father of the Viscount de Noailles, remained all day at the side of the unhappy king, defending him with his body against the rabble, which had invaded his palace. The Duke d'Ayen, who had retired to Switzerland in disgust, returned to resume his office as captain of the body-guard, which, although abolished, was in his eyes re-created by the peril of the king. Though he had been strongly impressed with the ideas of 1789, he mourned bitterly over the excesses to which they had led, and, with his son-in-law, M. de Grammont, faithfully followed their unhappy sovereign until he sought ignominious shelter on the threshold of the Assembly. After all was over, he again sought refuge in Switzerland.

M. de Noailles was now a proscribed exile in England; M. de Lafayette a prisoner in Austria; Madame de Lafayette a captive on parole at Chavaniac; Madame d'Ayen, her eldest daughter, and her mother-in-law, the aged Maréchale de Noailles, remained in their hotel at Paris, where they were soon to fall a sacrifice to the bloodthirsty faction which was now master of France.

The Maréchal de Mouchy, the head of the younger branch of the family of Noailles, had been already detained five months in the Luxembourg, together with his wife, who had been born in that palace, in the room under that where she was now imprisoned, and had also left it a bride. In the April of 1794 the aged Maréchale de Noailles, now a widow, and partly imbecile

from age, the Duchess d'Ayen, and the Viscountess de Noailles, were removed thither. The acts of their martyrdom, for such it may well be called from the spirit in which it was endured, are thus given by M. Carrichon, their confessor, a priest of the Oratory :—

"I knew the Maréchale by sight, the two others well. I visited them once a week while they were still confined in their hotel. The terror was increasing with the crimes of the revolution, and the victims became daily more numerous. One day, when I was exhorting them to be prepared, I said to them, from a kind of presentiment: 'If you are sent to the guillotine, and God gives me strength, I will go with you.' They took me at my word, and said eagerly, 'You will promise.'? After a moment's hesitation I answered, 'Yes; and that you may be sure to know me, I will wear a dark blue coat and a red waistcoat.' They often afterwards reminded me of my promise."

After their removal to the Luxembourg, M. Carrichon often heard of his penitents through M. Grellet, the tutor of Madame de Noailles's children, who contrived to keep up a communication with the prisoners, and used to take the little boys daily to a spot whence their mother could see them from a window of the prison.

"He often reminded me," says M. Carrichon, "of my promise, and on the 27th of June he came to beg me to render the same service to the Maréchal de Mouchy and his wife. I made my way into the court of the palace. I was long near them, and kept them in sight for a quarter of an hour, but M. and Madame de Mouchy, whom I had only seen once at their own house, and whom I knew better than they knew me, could not distinguish me. By the inspiration and help of God I did what I could for them. The Maréchal was singularly edifying, and was praying vocally with all his heart. He said, as he left the Luxembourg, to some who were showing sympathy for him, 'At seventeen I mounted the breach for my king, at seventy-seven I mount the scaffold for my God. My friends, I am not to be pitied.'"

One of the accusations brought against the Maréchal was, that he had sheltered priests, and that a *ci-devant Christ* had been found in his room.

"On the 22nd of July," continues M. Carrichon, "I was at home between eight and ten in the morning. I was just going out when I heard a knock at the door. On opening it, I saw M. Grellet and his two pupils, the children with the gaiety of their age, which overpowered their recent losses and the fear of those which were to come; the tutor sad, pale, and pensive. 'Let us go into your study,' he said, 'and leave the children in this room.' As I shut the door he threw himself into a chair. 'It is all over, my friend,' he said; 'those ladies are before the revolu-

tionary tribunal. I come to claim your promise. I am going to take the children to Vincennes to their little sister, and there I shall prepare them for this terrible blow.' Prepared as I had long been, I was terribly disturbed. At last I said, 'Leave me to change my dress, and pray to God to give me strength to fulfil my promise.' We found the poor children playing as merrily as possible. The sight and the thought of what they were about to hear, and of their meeting with their poor little sister, made my heart bleed. . . . I went to the palace between one and two. It was impossible to get in. . . I returned about five o'clock, and, after another hour of tedious expectation, I saw by a movement in the crowd that the prison door was about to open. I placed myself close to the entrance; for the last fortnight it had been impossible to gain entrance into the court. The first cart was filled, and came towards me. It contained eight ladies of most edifying demeanour. Seven were unknown to me; the last, to whom I was very near, was the Maréchale de Noailles. I felt a momentary ray of hope when I saw her without her daughter-in-law and her granddaughter; but, alas! they immediately appeared in the second cart. Madame de Noailles was in white, which she had worn ever since the death of her father-in-law and mother-in-law, the Maréchal and Maréchale de Mouchy. She did not look more than four-and-twenty at the utmost. They had hardly taken their places when I saw the daughter show her mother all her wonted tender affection. I heard those around me say, 'Look at that young woman, how earnestly she is speaking to the other.' I seemed to hear what they were saying: 'Mama, he is not there;—look again;—I assure you, Mama, he is not there, nothing escapes me.' They forgot that I had told them it would be impossible for me to get into the court. The first cart remained close to me for at least a quarter of an hour. It passed on; the second came forward; I drew nearer; they did not see me. I turned back, went a long way round, and placed myself at the entrance of the Pont au Change in a conspicuous position. Madame de Noailles cast her eyes all around her. She passed on, and had not seen me. I followed them along the bridge, separated from them by the crowd, but still near them. Madame de Noailles still looked intently for me in vain. Madame d'Ayen's face bespoke visible anxiety. Her daughter redoubled her efforts without success. I was tempted to give it up. I said to myself, 'I have done what I could. The crowd will be the same everywhere; it will be impossible for me to see them.' I was about to withdraw, when the sky darkened, thunder was heard in the distance. I said to myself, 'I will try again.' By a short cut I arrived before the carts in the Rue S. Antoine, nearly opposite to the too celebrated prison of La Force. There a violent wind arose; the storm burst in its fury; flashes of lightning and claps of thunder rapidly succeeded each other; the rain fell in torrents. I took shelter under the door-way of a shop, which, to this day, I cannot look at without emotion. In one moment the street was swept: not a person was to be seen except in the door-ways, the shops, and at the windows. There was now no order in the procession. Those on horseback and on foot hastened their pace and the carts also. They came to the little S. Antoine, and I was still undecided. The first passed before me. By a hasty and

almost involuntary movement I left the shop and followed the other. I was alone with my penitents. Madame de Noailles caught sight of me, and her smile seemed to say: 'There you are at last, oh! how thankful we are; we have been long looking for you. Mama, there he is.' Madame d'Ayen revived. All my irresolution ceased. I felt by the grace of God filled with extraordinary courage. Bathed with sweat and rain, I continued to walk close by them. . . . The storm was at its height, the wind more and more impetuous. The poor old Maréchale de Noailles was terribly tormented by it; her large cap was blown aside and exposed some of her grey hairs. She tottered on the miserable plank on which she was seated, her hands tied behind her back. She was insulted by the cries of some who were standing there, notwithstanding the rain. She bore it all with great patience. At last we came to the cross-way before the Faubourg S. Antoine. I went forward, looked all round, and said to myself: 'This is the best place to give them what they so earnestly desire.' The cart was going slower; I turned towards them, making a sign to Madame de Noailles which she perfectly understood. 'Mama, M. Carrichon is going to give us absolution.' Then they bent their heads with an expression of penitence, contrition, hope, and piety. I raised my hand, and with my head covered, I pronounced the form of absolution, and then the words which follow it very distinctly and with supernatural attention. They united their intention more fervently than ever. I shall never forget that beautiful sight. From that moment the storm abated, the rain diminished, and seemed to have been sent only to render that solemn absolution possible. I blessed God for it, and they also. Their deportment betokened content, security, and joy. . . . At last we reached the fatal spot; the scaffold was before us. The carts stopped, the guards surrounded them, and then a more numerous circle of spectators, the greater part laughing and amusing themselves at this horrible spectacle. I shuddered to be among them. While the executioner with two assistants was helping the ladies to descend from the first cart, Madame de Noailles was looking for me: she perceived me. How many things did she express to me by those animated, sweet, expressive eyes, now raised to heaven, now fixed upon me in a way which would have brought observation upon me if my neighbours had not been otherwise occupied. I drew my hat over my brow without losing sight of her. I seemed to understand all that she would say; the expression of her countenance was so touching and so eloquent that the spectators said one to another: 'Oh! how happy that young woman looks, how she raises her eyes to heaven, how she prays; but what good will it do her?'

"They now descended from the carts. I thanked God that I had not waited till that moment to give them the absolution; we could not have united ourselves so tranquilly to give and receive this great grace as we had done on the way. I left my place, and came and faced the wooden staircase which led to the scaffold. The Maréchale de Noailles was opposite to me, in mourning for her husband. She was seated on a block of wood or stone, with her large eyes fixed. I had not forgotten to do for her what I had done for so many others. The rest were ranged in two lines on the side

opposite to the Faubourg S. Antoine. I looked for Madme d'Ayen and her daughter. I saw the mother in an attitude of devotion, simple, noble, resigned, and wholly absorbed in the sacrifice which she was about to make to God by the merits of His Divine Son, free from all disquietude; she looked, in short, as I used to see her when she had the happiness to receive Holy Communion. That sight I shall never forget; it is ineffaceable. I often seem to see her in that attitude. God grant that I may benefit by the recollection. The Maréchale de Noailles was the third to ascend the altar of sacrifice; six ladies followed. Madame d'Ayen was the tenth, well pleased, as it seemed to me, to die before her child. The executioner snatched off her cap. As it was fastened by a pin which he had not withdrawn, her hair was violently torn from her head, causing an expression of pain to appear on her features. The mother disappeared; her sweet and loving daughter took her place: when I looked upon her in her white dress, looking much younger than she was, like a gentle little lamb ready for the slaughter, I seemed to myself to be witnessing the martyrdom of one of the young virgins or holy women of the primitive Church. What happened to her mother happened also to her. There was the same momentary expression of pain, and then the same calmness, the same death. 'She is very happy,' cried I interiorly, when her body was thrown into that dreadful receptacle. Madame de Noailles, as well as her mother, had addressed some earnest exhortations to their companions in death, and among others to a young man who had uttered a fearful blasphemy in her hearing. As she was about to mount the bloody staircase leading to the scaffold, she turned her angelic countenance upon him and said, 'For God's love, Monsieur, say I forgive them.'"

Five years passed after this tragic day before the three surviving sisters met to spend a few weeks together in Holland. Before they parted they agreed to unite together every evening in spirit, and to say the following prayers composed by the three.

"The souls of the just are in the hand of God, and the torment of death shall not touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seem to die; and their departure is taken for misery, and their going away from us for utter destruction; but they are in peace, and though in the sight of men they suffered torments, their hope is full of immortality. O Lord, who hast made thy light and thy truth to shine upon them, to lead them to thy holy mountain and to make them enter into thy sanctuary, have mercy on us.

"O Lord, who hast been their support and their strength, have mercy on us.

"O Lord, who hast created them for Thy glory, protected them by Thy power, saved them by Thy mercy, have mercy on us.

"O Lord, who art now their refuge and their everlasting reward, have mercy on us.

"Be mindful of that mercy which Thou showest from generation to

generation on those that fear Thee. We beseech Thee, O Lord, save the children of Thine handmaid. In Thee, O my God, have they put their trust. Thou wilt not suffer us to be confounded for ever. We beseech Thee, O Lord, save the children of Thy handmaid.

"PRACTICE.

"Let us seek to enter into the same dispositions as these dear victims when preparing for death. In union with them let us meditate upon their happiness while we cease not to say with the Church, *requiem æternam dona eis Domine.*

"Let us hope to receive new benedictions for the fulfilment of the duties of our state, each according to her need. Let us beseech the Lord to increase in us His love, and to accomplish in us His will. Let us unite our prayers to those of the Church militant, of the Church suffering, but, still more, of the Church triumphant, by this perpetual canticle. Amen. Alleluia.

"As the disciple of Elias, when he saw him ascending to heaven, asked for a double portion of his spirit, let us ask their spirit, that we may be able to follow their footsteps upon earth. We have seen them weeping as they cast their seed upon the ground; one day we shall see them returning with joy, bearing their sheaves with them. Alleluia. Alleluia. Alleluia.

"Thou didst make them pass through fire and water to bring them to a place of refreshment. Alleluia.

"In Thee, O Lord, is the fountain of life, and in Thy light do they now see light. Alleluia.

"Thou hast been pleased to deliver them from all their troubles, that their eternal joy may be to sing Thy praise. Alleluia.

"As Azarias, Ananias, and Misael blessed the Lord in the furnace, so the three sisters now left in this vale of tears, desire to glorify Him in the midst of their sorrow."

If Madame d'Ayen seemed fitted above all things to be a mother, Madame de Lafayette was above all things distinguished as a wife. Her devotion to the *icy pedant,* her husband, who was not, however, icy to her, nor, to do him justice, to his family or friends in general, surpassed even the ordinary love of woman. It not only nerved her to face danger and obloquy for him, and to share with him exile and captivity, but it unhappily verged upon such idolatry as should be paid by no Christian to any mortal being, and which is specially dangerous to a Christian wife wedded to an unbelieving husband. One thing, however, it left untouched—her faith as a Catholic Christian. She could adopt his political theories and use the republican shibboleths of the time, but the *citoyenne Lafayette* ever held fast to the faith of her childhood; nor could her attachment to her husband, or her regard for his popularity,

ever induce her to hear the mass of a constitutional priest, or in any way to hold communion *in sacris* with those who had rebelled against the authority of the Church. Nay, though she bore with their presence, as private individuals, at the general's table, she pointedly absented herself when the *assermenté* Bishop of Paris came to dine with him on his installation. No consideration could induce her to receive him as her diocesan. Her witty and free-thinking aunt, Madame de Tessé, said that her devotion was *a medley of the Catechism and the Declaration of Rights*. The unswerving integrity of Madame de Lafayette's faith, under circumstances so trying, is the more remarkable from the fact that, in her early girlhood, she had been so painfully beset by doubts, that her mother thought it expedient to defer her first communion, which was not made till after her marriage, at the age of sixteen. But though it left her faith intact, and never interfered with the conscientious discharge of all her religious obligations, it may be that it was the absorbing nature of her attachment to her husband which prevented her from attaining that high degree of interior perfection which so admirably characterized Madame de Montagu.

The details of Madame de Lafayette's last illness are touchingly given in a letter from her husband, written at the close of a union of thirty-four years. "She was fourteen and I was sixteen," he says, "when her heart first identified itself with all that affected me." Her illness, of more than a month's duration, was one long delirium, full of beautiful and pious fancies, pervaded by the master-passion of her life, never so freely and fully expressed before. "Had her mind," says M. de Lafayette, "been in its usual state, she would have thought it her duty to fix her thoughts upon *what she called her sins*, and to distract them from the sentiments which filled all the faculties of her soul." The details which he gives are deeply mournful, for it is clear that the sentiment which had constituted her earthly happiness, had ever been troubled by an undercurrent of deep anxiety for the soul in which her own was bound up. "Amid all her illusions," says her husband, "she only deceived herself with regard to me for a few moments, in which she persuaded herself that I had become a fervent Christian." It was but momentary, and accompanied by doubts and questions which proved that it was less an illusion than an intense desire.

"'Are you not a Christian?' she said to me one day, and as I made no answer—'Ah! I know what you are, you are a Fayettiste.' 'You think I am very proud,' replied I, 'but are you not a little of the same opinion yourself?' 'Oh! yes,' cried she, 'with all my heart, I would give my life for that sect.'"

M. de Lafayette tells us that the delirium began after she had received, as he expresses it, *her sacraments*. How much of loneliness of heart, in the midst of the most intense earthly affection, does the following passage reveal:—

"Towards the close of her agony, and while she still retained the use of speech, my daughters feared that the habit of not occupying herself with objects of piety before me might be a restraint upon her saying or hearing prayers. A little crucifix was by her side, but, instead of taking it, she seized my hand, which she held between her own in the attitude of prayer. Probably she was praying for me. They asked me to leave her for a moment, in order that Madame de Montagu, who had always possessed her confidence on these subjects, might ask her if she had anything to say to her. My first impulse was to reject this request, tenderly and timidly as it was made. I feared that these last moments might be disturbed. I even acknowledge that my old conjugal affection for the first time experienced a feeling of jealousy. I felt a passionate desire to occupy her exclusively. I wanted all her looks, all her thoughts. But I overcame myself, wishing to leave her nothing to desire. I gave up my place to her sister, who repeated her question twice; but, though my wife loved her dearly and liked to have her near her, she twice answered 'No,' adding, 'Go to supper,' and seeming impatient that I should resume my place. As soon as I had done so, she once more put my hand between hers, saying, 'I am all yours.' These words—*toute à vous*—were the last which she uttered."

He passes on to a heartfelt and well-deserved eulogium upon the noble conduct of this "falcon-hearted dove," during the revolutionary troubles. "You know, as well as I do, all that she was, all that she did, during the Revolution." It was little that, in the words of Charles Fox, she had flown to Olmutz on the wings of love and duty, to share her husband's captivity. But he dwells specially upon her having remained in France, at her own exceeding personal risk, till she had satisfied all the claims of his creditors, and sent their son to America, to be brought up under the care of Washington; and on the "noble imprudence" which forbade her to conceal the name which had become so perilous to her. It appears that in those evil days many, even excellent and high-minded women, had brought themselves to pretend a fictitious divorce, in order to preserve the rights and property of their children; but every one of the energetic declarations and touching petitions which she addressed to the republican authorities began with these words, "Femme Lafayette."

We trust that the husband so deeply loved and so more than duly honoured fulfilled one of her last injunctions imploring him to read, for the love of her, "certain books which assuredly," he says, "I shall examine again with deep seriousness."

In this recommendation, he adds, "she called her religion, to make it more acceptable to me, 'the sovereign liberty,' as she often quoted to me these words of the Abbé Fauchet—'Jesus Christ, my ONLY Master.'"

The memoir of Madame de Montagu* is marked by literary merit, independent of the interest of its principal subject, of the various remarkable characters by whom she was surrounded, and of the touching and striking incidents of her life. It combines, with its fervent piety, the sparkling animation peculiar to French biography. The romantic, mournful, and withal, at times, ludicrous scenes which diversify the history of the emigration, and the strangely contrasted characters which community of misfortune then often threw together, are sketched with a masterly touch. Among the victims involved in one common calamity there were those who suffered with meek fortitude as confessors for their faith, no less than as loyal subjects of their king; others, who had been contemptuously cast on foreign strands by the tempest which their own reckless folly had contributed to raise, and who sought to alleviate the weariness of exile by a melancholy imitation of the life of brilliant trifling and frigid philosophism which had formed the staple of Parisian society for the last half-century. With a household of the former class Madame de Montagu formed a close intimacy during the short period of her stay in England. It was the family of M. le Rebours, formerly president of the Parliament of Paris—a household marked by close family union and fervent piety, mingled with somewhat of the austerity which in those days was often an attendant of piety in France, even among those who were free from the errors of Jansenism. The family consisted of Madame le Rebours, her father and mother, and her six children, two girls already grown up—industrious, fervent, and recollected, and four fine boys, as modest and almost as shy as their sisters. M. de Barville, the grandfather, a venerable grey-haired magistrate, educated the elder ones; Madame de Barville daily catechized the younger. She was a tall, thin, somewhat severe-looking person, with eyes still full of animation, speaking little, but always sensibly, piously, and to the purpose. An aged exiled priest, named Durand, who had become the pastor of this little flock, said Mass daily in a large room set apart for the purpose. The whole family attended; among the servants were three good old men, who had grown gray in the president's service; the day was regularly closed at nine o'clock by a pious lecture and prayers, in which the king and his family were never forgotten. Madame

* The English translation just published is worthy of the original.

de Montagu never failed, if possible, to be present at these devotions. She was there on the day when the news of the king's murder reached Margate. The Abbé Durand, who was saying night prayers, stopped short at the place usually filled by the prayer for the king, and after a moment's silence he substituted for it a *De profundis*, begun in a broken voice and responded to by tears. But when the old priest would have passed on to the prayers which usually followed that which he had omitted, Madame de Barville, who was at the other end of the room, interrupted him by saying aloud: "We have not come to that yet, M. l'Abbé,—the prayer for the king." So well had those faithful hearts preserved in a foreign land the old French adage, —"Le roi est mort; vive le roi."

Madame de Montagu was no economist. In spite of her best endeavours, when she set to work to cut out garments, the woful waste of stuff showed her attempts at housewifery to be worse than useless. She laughed over her mishaps, but it was with tears in her eyes. England was too expensive a residence; and, after months of suffering and privation, she found shelter under the hospitable care of her aunt, the Countess de Tessé, one of the most remarkable women of her time.

Possessed of greater foresight than her brother, the Duke d'Ayen, Madame de Tessé had not left France "like a swallow carrying nothing with her but the plumage of her wings"; she had secured capital of some value, which she invested in land at Lowemberg, in the canton of Fribourg. It was a large farm, with plenty of pasturage for flocks. Here she and her husband (always subordinate to herself) lived at their ease, though without luxury, and were enabled to afford liberal hospitality to many of their friends and countrymen less well provided than themselves. Madame de Tessé was, alas! that most unlovely thing, an unbelieving woman; one of those intellectual ladies of the *old régime* who had been fascinated and led astray by the false philosophy of the age. She was a Liberal and a freethinker. In philosophy Voltaire, with whom she had been very intimate, was her master; in politics her nephew, M. de Lafayette, was her hero. Madame de Montagu had much to endure in her new home from the society into which she was thrown; but Madame de Tessé, notwithstanding her mental and spiritual aberrations, possessed a kindness and largeness of heart which endeared her to all her family. She was, moreover, happily extremely inconsistent in her speculative ideas. Professing and believing herself to be above all the prejudices of faith, she never failed to make a large sign of the cross behind her curtain whenever she took medicine. She loved not priests, but, by a happy inconsistency, she supported, on the produce of

her kitchen garden, three poor exiled priests who lived at Gormund; she would take Madame de Montagu to visit them, and, while she was deep in discussion with one, Madame de Montagu would quietly take another aside, and, kneeling down in a corner almost close to her aunt, who, notwithstanding her sharp eyes, saw nothing, she would make her confession at her ease.

Madame de Tessé had attracted to her solitude, in order to have some one to talk to after her own fashion, one of her old friends, the Marquis de Mun, formerly *beau cavalier*, and still *beau causeur, beau joueur*, full of wit, benevolence, and imperturbable *sang-froid*. His son, Adrian, an amiable and spirited young man, was of the party. We have already made acquaintance with him him in the "Récit d'une Sœur," as the bereaved and heart-broken father, to whom his son, another Adrian, brought a sunbeam to cheer his home, and to herald the light of faith in his heart in the person of Eugénie de la Ferronnays. As for *M. le Comte de Tessé, grand d'Espagne de première classe, Chevalier des ordres, lieutenant-général des armées du Roi, premier écuyer de la feue Reine, et naguère député du Maine aux Etats généraux*, he looked after the cultivation of the land, made various journeys when necessary, but figured little in the *salon*, and was, in fact, altogether eclipsed by his wife. The whole colony was afterwards removed from Switzerland to the shores of the Baltic. The same way of life was continued there; perpetual discussions, varied by the reading of romances. Madame de Montagu was doomed to listen in succession to the "Chevaliers du Cygne" of Madame de Genlis, then to "Clarissa Harlowe" for a whole mortal month; succeeded by "Tristram Shandy"; varied occasionally by a life from Plutarch, or an *oraison funèbre* from Bossuet. Bossuet and Plutarch were well enough, and even the romances better than the discussions which followed them. In her change of abode, however, Madame de Tessé had provided herself with (what she accounted a somewhat unnecessary luxury) a chaplain, the post being occupied by an exiled priest, named the Abbé de Luchet. His office was next to a sinecure; but, as she said with a smile to M. de Mun, "there is my niece to employ him." The Abbé de Luchet was awkward and absent, and it was long before Madame de Montagu could open her heart to him. But she found him at last to be a most worthy priest; not, perhaps, very capable of disentangling a sophistry, but very good to direct a simple, upright soul in the right way. She assisted daily at the old man's Mass, which he said in his attic, M. de Mun's valet, who served his Mass, being the only other worshipper. On Sundays two respectable emi-

grants of the neighbourhood increased the number of the congregation. But as Christmas drew near some of the country people, though living at a considerable distance, asked permission to come to the midnight Mass. At eleven o'clock, on a bitter cold Christmas-eve, the strangers knocked at the door. The attic was not yet prepared, and Madame de Montagu received them in the kitchen, where a great fire had been lighted. The party consisted of two or three families of peasants, very decently dressed. The women, like the men, wore thick leather gaiters, with the hair inside. The patriarch of the band, whose hair was white as snow, and his back bent with age, told Madame de Montagu that neither he nor his father or grandfather had ever had the happiness of hearing Mass at the hour of our Saviour's birth. He had come with his company many leagues across the marshes to adore the new-born Jesus in His crib, and to take part in a festival which had not perhaps been celebrated in that country since the Reformation. He belonged to the very scanty number of Catholic families which had never either apostatized or emigrated, and which, notwithstanding persecution and distance from all religious aid, had remained faithful to the religion of their fathers. While the old man told his tale, the women had gathered round the fire to dry their steaming garments, one of them reciting the rosary, while the others responded in a low voice. The men stood with their heads uncovered. The Abbé de Luchet's room would not hold all the congregation, so the door was left open, notwithstanding the cold, and some knelt on the steps of the staircase. Madame de Montagu often said that never had she heard a midnight mass sung at S. Roch, to the pealing organ and by the light of a thousand tapers, which touched her so deeply as this midnight celebration by a proscribed priest in an attic before that rustic audience. It seemed to carry her back to the midst of the shepherds in the stable of Bethlehem. Never, perhaps, had the Divine infant received homage more acceptable since S. Francis sang the Gospel at the midnight Mass in the cave at Grecio, when he instituted the touching devotion to the *Crib* which has since pervaded Christendom.

It was during her sojourn in Holstein that Madame de Montagu undertook her gigantic task, *L'Œuvre des Emigrés*. Devotion to the poor had ever formed one of the distinctive features of her lovely character. She shared it with all her sisters, but it seemed to be intensified in her, perhaps as a recompense for the acts of faith and humility by which, in the full tide of her greatness and prosperity, Madame d'Ayen had sought a pious beggar-woman to stand godmother for her little Pauline.

The poor whose sufferings now weighed upon her heart were of those on whom poverty falls hardest, from the softness and ease in which they have been nurtured. "When she saw those old soldiers and wandering priests, those magistrates without bread, those widows and young mothers scarcely able to find clothes for their children, so many respectable families in want of the mere necessaries of life, the tears filled her eyes, and she felt almost ashamed of the security and abundance which she enjoyed with her aunt."

By dint of thinking and praying she came at last to the conviction that an appeal to public charity was the only possible means of affording effectual succour to all this misery. She at first thought of making a quête in Holstein; but her views gradually extended much farther. By inquiries as to the actual state of the emigrants, she discovered that there were at least forty thousand to support, and she set to work to beg by letter through every part of Europe. One of her most active assistants in this work of charity was the Count de Stolberg, then president of the Lutheran Consistory of the province. His wife, a Protestant like himself, was gentle, charitable, and pious. The intimacy thus established with Madame de Montagu led subsequently to the conversion of both. The work thus begun soon became universal; money flowed in to Madame de Montagu on all sides, but unhappily appeals for aid in still greater abundance; she was compelled to husband her resources. "My niece," Madame de Tessé would say laughingly, "gives everybody twelve sous less than they want to make them happy." But the twelve sous which she spared were for the daily bread of some other petitioner.

She was continually rummaging in her boxes and cupboards for something to sell or to give. She ended by making away with the black dress which she had worn in mourning for her mother, and which she treasured piously as a kind of relic; another time she sold her office-book. She gave everything,—her labour, her time, her sleep. The common distress touched her own family as well as others, but she scrupled to give them anything but the price of her own labour. One day Madame de Tessé, seeing her labouring hard to finish some embroidery, guessed that some one was waiting for the price of it, and gave her a gold box of the weight of six louis, bidding her give it to the emigrant whom she most desired to help. Madame de Montagu sent it at once to her father-in-law, M. de Beaune, for whom she had been labouring. It was in the month of January, 1798, and the old chief of the coalition of Auvergne had not wood to light his fire.

"You are out of place here, my dear niece," said Madame de

Tessé to her one day. "To do all you want to do, you ought to be either a *sœur grise* or the Empress of Russia."

Madame de Montagu ended a long life full of good works in 1839, on the 21st of January, the feast of S. Francis of Sales, to whom she had ever borne a special devotion, and to whose character of mingled sweetness and strength her own bore a marked resemblance. Her sweetness, like his, was, to use his own words, won at the sword's point, though the victory had been early won. The most lively remembrance of Madame de Montagu's early youth was that of her own *conversion*, which took place at twelve years old. Till that time she had been indocile, impetuous, and changeable, governed by outward impressions and altogether unmanageable; she would pass in one moment from violent anger to overflowing penitence, to fall back again the next moment into the very faults over which she had been weeping. With these natural dispositions she became, even before her first communion, gentle, patient, studious, and submitted not only to the common obligations of her state, but to severer rules which she traced out for herself. Her piety throughout life had a singularly attractive power even over those who had no sympathy with piety in general. Her aunt's philosophical friend, M. de Mun, used to say that Madame de Montagu was the only *dévote* who ever gave him a desire to save his soul. With a heart singularly alive to the tenderest affections of kindred, she was subjected to the trial of surviving many whom she loved. In early life her two first children had been snatched from her in infancy.

At the death of the first her sorrow was so uncontrollable that her father-in-law took alarm, and stole away the picture of her baby from her. The next day he found her drawing it from memory; she was sitting, her eyes red with weeping, before the empty cradle, with the nurse by her side, whom she was painting also. M. de Beaune grew impatient with this indulgence of her grief, and, not to displease him, she ceased from that moment to speak of her child, and even went into society with him, thinking in her unselfish care for others that he needed the distraction; but the efforts which she made injured her health. The death of her second child was marked by a still more touching incident. After having watched the agony of her little girl the whole night through, as she was praying and weeping by her lifeless body, she was told that her sister, Madame de Grammont, who was then at the hotel de Noailles, had just given birth to her first child. This news, which at any other time would have been most joyful, at that moment could not have failed to increase her grief; but, to her husband's astonishment, she rose, dressed, asked if her eyes showed that she had been

crying, and told him that she was going to her sister. He tried in vain to dissuade her; she was afraid that the young and happy mother would be uneasy at her absence, and that some one would tell her the cause. She went therefore to the hotel de Noailles, saw the new-born baby in his cradle, embraced her sister with a calm and smiling countenance. She thought to return as she went, but her strength failed her; before she could reach her carriage, she fell fainting in an adjoining room.

The aged Duke de Noailles passed his last years under the care of his beloved daughter. In his last illness she ventured to speak to him more urgently upon religion than she had ever dared to do in her life before. He listened with visible emotion —received the last sacraments from the curé of Fontenay, and died peacefully in her arms. Attala de Montagu, who had been born during the exile of his family in Holstein, met with an accident when out hunting, the effects of which proved fatal. He died at the age of twenty-eight, giving most edifying marks of faith, courage, and resignation. M. de Montagu died the death of the just in January, 1834. His loss left a great void in the hearts of his wife and children; but they had no anxiety for his eternal happiness; he had not waited till the last hour to reconcile himself with God. M. de Lafayette closed a very different career a few months afterwards. Madame de Montagu survived her husband about five years, and then went peacefully to rest. Her children crowded around her at the first news of her illness; her face lighted up with joy when she heard their footsteps; she would fain not have grieved them even by her death, which she saw approaching, and yet she was joyful at the thought of rejoining those who had gone before her to heaven. She neither feared nor desired death, but asked her children to repeat with her—"Thy will be done." This had been her watchword throughout life; it was her passport in death. Mass was celebrated in her room; she followed the prayers in a kind of rapture, and her thanksgiving was interrupted only by the agony of death. A few hours afterwards she fell asleep in the Lord, in the seventy-third year of her age.

We strongly recommend any of our readers who may be still unacquainted with it, to possess themselves of this charming memoir of Madame de Montagu, which, in addition to its other claims on our attention, *se vend au profit des pauvres*,—for the benefit of the poor whom she so dearly loved,—and to whom, in the quaint phrase of her peasants at Fontenay, she was *pire qu'une mère*. Her labours in the *Œuvre des Emigrés*, and the sweet, loving, and hopeful spirit in which she worked, strongly remind us of another confessor of those days, the saintly Abbé

Carron. His memory is still blessed amongst us, and the works which he began here in his exile still abide. The chapel and schools of Somers' Town, and the convent of the "Faithful Companions of Jesus," bear witness to his labours of love. But of how many holy priests, cast by the reign of terror upon our shores, no record now remains. They came and went, they lived and laboured here in patience, poverty, and prayer. They received the alms and the hospitality of England; they lifted up holy hands for her before God, and more, far more, in their poor attics and lowly dwellings they offered up the Immaculate Lamb for the land once reeking with the blood of His saints. This, and the testimony of their pure and innocent lives, is all we know of them; but who shall say how large a debt we owe them for the revival of Catholicity in England, or how many, even individual conversions, may have indirectly followed from the melting away of the mists of prejudice before the gentle light of their example, and before the might of His Eucharistic presence, whom they brought once more amongst us—"who stood in the midst of us, and we knew Him not!"

Even apart from visible indications of extraordinary sanctity, the feeling inspired by the exiles in general was one of respectful sympathy. We have often heard that feeling expressed by the late Sir George Lee, the owner of Hartwell House, where Louis XVIII. and his little court passed the greater portion of their exile in England.

The old Elizabethan manor-house was crowded with inmates bearing the noblest names in France. Not an alcove or a summer-house sheltered beneath the stately cedars and chestnuts of the park but was turned into a dwelling-place, and yet, at the end of five years spent in a lonely village, in enforced idleness, by over a hundred persons, many of whom had been reared in luxury and self-indulgence, their benevolent and noble-hearted host could say, with tears in his eyes, that they had *left neither a scandal nor a debt behind them.* What they did leave behind them and what still lingers among the cottagers to this day, is the memory of the charity of Louis XVI.'s daughter to the poor.

Art. V.—DR. LEE ON ANGLICAN ORDERS.

The Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England. By the Rev. F. G. Lee, D.C.L.

MANY a fortress has been preserved to its defenders by a show of merely apparent strength; and the besiegers have often struck their tents from before walls which needed hardly more than a trumpet-blast to rend them

From turret to foundation-stone,

and lay their pride in ruins. We all know the old stories of numberless camp-followers standing in arms before the messengers of the foe—the veriest shadow of strength; of ambassadors led through granaries where the wheat was thinly strewn over heaps of useless sand; of banquets where plenty seemed to reign while the givers fought against the pangs of hunger; every device by which weakness is made to appear as strength, and the hour of triumph or defeat delayed is familiar to us all. But in them all we find that the besieged had one point in their favour, which was often the element of their success, and that was the ignorance of their enemies as to their real condition. Their dire distress was not known; the weak points in their defences were not seen; the walls of their granaries spoke not of the hollow mockery of plenty which they showed. And we could not but feel, while reading Dr. Lee's book, that the fortress of Anglican Orders is not only not impregnable, but is not even safe. He has thrown down the gauntlet without, to all seeming, a thought of fear or mistrust; he has heaped page upon page of testimonies gathered from the four winds of heaven; and yet, despite it all, we cannot help the conviction coming over us that it is only show; the last effort of one who feels that his position is no longer tenable, if its real state should be known. He lacks the element which could bring success, want of knowledge on the part of those arrayed against him. We know all the weak points in his defences, we are prepared to see grains of reasoning strewn over barren sand; and knowing all this we admire his boldness, but we cannot congratulate him on his success.

The author has striven hard to make his *catena* of evidence in the case perfect;—link after link is laboured at with a perseverance worthy of a cause less desperate; and certainly from the preface to the Ordinal of Edward VI. down to Mr. De Lisle's evidence

of Sir Harry Trelawney's opinions in 1831, sufficient space is given for an exceeding great amount of industry. Into the details of each chapter we cannot enter, since their consideration would require a volume bulky as that of our author; but we hope by discussing the main points, historical and theological, of the controversy, to afford our readers ample proof of our assertion that the fortress of Anglican Orders is not defensible or safe. The canonical questions connected with it we purposely leave untouched, because the validity, which is all that Dr. Lee contends for, is not affected by them.

The first part of the book is taken up by a long series of extracts from various sources, consisting of the forms for ordination and consecration; and they are quoted as so many arguments in favour of the theory that the Anglican form is valid. How far they support this theory we shall see in the course of our examination. The groundwork of our argument shall be an extract from the book itself. At page 81 the author says: "Martene sums up what is essential for the ordination of a priest in the eighteenth section of the ninth article of his treatise—a conclusion which harmonizes completely with the principles which underlay the revised Ordinal of the English Church from the year 1549 to its final revision in 1662, and which equally characterizes it in its existing form. He thus states his decision—Cum igitur materia presbyteratus dici non possit traditio instrumentorum, nec consequenter forma verba illa solemnia, quæ tunc profert cum illa tradit episcopus; restat ut totam ejus essentiam in impositione manuum et orationibus, quæ consequenter recitantur, tertiâ præsertim prolixa, quæ per modum præfationis cantatur, in antiquis Pontificalibus *Consecratio* dicta, constituamus. Hanc solam hactenus agnoscunt omnes Orientales, hanc solam Patres antiqui, hanc solam Scriptura." Dr. Lee here accepts the decision of Dom Martene regarding the validity of matter and form; nay more, he professes from that decision to make his own case good. Now Martene says that "the whole essence" of the priesthood consists in "the imposition of hands and the prayers which are said after, especially the third long one, which is sung in the style of a preface, and called in the old Pontificals *The Consecration.*" In these prayers the bishop expressly prays "super hos famulos tuos benedictionem Sancti Spiritus, et gratiæ sacerdotalis infunde virtutem"; and again, "Da, quæsumus, Omnipotens Pater, in hos famulos tuos Presbyterii dignitatem." From this we justly infer that in the form some words indicative of the order to be conferred should be expressed in order to render it valid. This conclusion is greatly strengthened by the very examples which Dr. Lee adduces; and we cannot help wondering at the state of mind which could induce him to believe that they tell for, instead of against himself. For

instance, in the form taken from the Apostolical Constitutions (p. 71) the Bishop prays thus, "Look down also now upon this Thy servant, elected by the consent of the whole clergy into the order of presbyters." At page 92 he confesses that in the Greek MS. quoted by Morinus, there is in the form "a prayer asking for special graces fitting and appropriate for each respective office." In the Oriental form (p. 101) the Bishop prays, "O God, who hast honoured with the title of priest those accounted worthy to discharge the holy ministry of the word of Thy Truth in this degree . . . . make Thy servant perfect, in all things well-pleasing unto Thee, and guiding well this great Priestly honour given unto him by Thy foreknowing power." Looking at all these testimonies drawn from such various sources, seeing (as a perusal of Dr. Lee's book shows) that in every case these prayers *are recited after* the imposition of hands, we can arrive at but one conclusion, that the expression in all these forms of the priestly office or its functions is without doubt a *sine quâ non* for the validity of the form of ordination. We have no intention of disputing the validity of priestly ordination in the Anglican Church on the ground of inadequate form; on the contrary, we confess that the form in the Ordinal of 1549 may be sufficient, though its terms are ambiguous; but the consideration of Martene's decision leads to the second part of our argument.

As in the ordination of priests, so in the consecration of bishops the matter and form consist in "impositione manuum et orationibus quæ eam consequenter recitantur." This is proved, as in the former case, by an appeal to the forms of consecration quoted by Dr. Lee. We need not reproduce them; it is sufficient to say that in every one the episcopal order or functions is mentioned. But there is in these forms one curious coincidence which we cannot refuse ourselves the pleasure of noticing. Amongst his other forms Dr. Lee quotes one "most ancient" from the Missale Francorum, to which he gives the date 550. It is a beautiful prayer, and contains ample reference to the office of a bishop, as for instance "chosen to the ministry of the High-Priesthood"—"complete in the Priest the chief (summam) of Thy ministry"—"give unto him the episcopal chair," &c. This form is, almost word for word, the prayer which is recited (quæ consequenter recitatur) after the imposition of hands, and the Accipe Spiritum Sanctum in the Roman Pontifical of to-day. So that the form which Rome now uses has at least the antiquity of nearly 1400 years to recommend it; and we may learn how much reliance is to be placed on Dr. Lee's testimony when he tells us that in "the prayer which immediately follows these words (Accipe Spiritum Sanctum) no mention is made of the episcopal function or dignity!" But we thank him nevertheless for the evidence he has adduced, and we realize once more the

truth "Fas est et ab hoste doceri." Comparing these forms, in each of which the office or dignity of bishop is designated, with that which Dr. Lee offers for our inspection in the Ordinal of 1549, we must confess a feeling of amazement at the supposition that there is anything in common between it and them. While in them everything is precise, every word weighed; in it we have a form as vague as words could make it; which would serve equally well for Confirmation as for Orders; and which, if it be sufficient, raises in our minds a doubt whether the Samaritans were not all bishops, since we read "they laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." We examine it word by word and line by line, only to rise from our deliberation convinced that it stands, like the Church to which it belongs, alone and isolated from the world. If we test it by the conditions which we find in the other forms we must declare it insufficient, null, and invalid. We say this in no spirit of triumph over Dr. Lee, it is simply the result of the evidence which he himself has placed before us, and which we have drawn out to its logical conclusions.

Before we turn to a consideration of the historical part of the work, we must turn aside for a few moments to study the new theology which we find laid down by Dr. Lee regarding Baptism and its effects. He opens Chapter XXI. with the theological axiom "Baptismus est janua Sacramentorum," and then after declaring its necessity, he goes on to say that actual baptism by water may be supplied in two ways, by desire or by martyrdom, as far as regards salvation. In this he is but declaring Catholic doctrine; but the conclusion which he ventures to deduce from this statement is so new that it deserves to be placed on record, if only to show what arguments men will dare to employ in a hopeless cause. Dr. Lee concludes (from the fact that baptism by desire is sufficient for salvation) that in the case "of persons who had never been validly baptized becoming bishops and consecrating others, it does not follow that their episcopal acts would be invalid. Because the baptism by desire is universally admitted to be sufficient for salvation when the baptism of water cannot be obtained, Dr. Lee says, "it seems to follow that he (who has only baptism by desire) is capable of receiving other sacraments, as ordination, though of course he would not be capable of receiving this validly had he knowingly neglected baptism, or should he neglect to supply the omission on becoming aware of it." We are told there is nothing new under the sun; but we venture to affirm that such a conclusion as this has been unknown hitherto to most people, if not to all. It might not be dangerous if it were recorded only as Dr. Lee's opinion; but he insinuates, if we rightly understand him, that his conclusion is endorsed, or, at least,

can be gathered from the ordinary teaching of Western Catholic doctors. Now, without one moment's hesitation, we declare that no Catholic could teach such a doctrine. Bellarmine, to whom Dr. Lee refers, and whom we choose as one of many, does not accept the conclusion; and we cannot help asking, did Dr. Lee read the whole chapter to which he refers, or did he read only so much as favoured his own opinion? For, after explaining in what baptism by desire supplies for baptism by water, Bellarmine gives his fourth proposition in these words:—"Martyrium, et Conversio ad Deum, licet Baptismata quædam sint; non sunt tamen Sacramenta." But for the reception of sacraments, it is necessary to pass through the gate of the sacraments, in other words, to receive sacramental baptism. If this be not true, then it must inevitably follow, from Dr. Lee's reasoning, that there can be a sacrament *without any matter or form;* which is manifestly absurd. The whole state of the question is so clearly put by Sardagna that we will quote the passage entire for the benefit of our readers; and that men may see how widely different is Dr. Lee's opinion from the teaching of the Catholic Church. "An baptismus sanguinis, seu martyrium suppleat in adultis virtutem baptismi aquæ? Resp: affirmative quoad effectum gratiæ, remissionem peccatorum, omnisque pœnæ peccato debitæ tam temporalis quam æternæ; quoad alios autem effectus, baptismus aquæ suppleri nequit; videlicet, quoad impressionem characteris, capacitatem proximam suscipiendi alia sacramenta, jus participandi bona Ecclesiæ, incorporationem cum Ecclesiâ, ac subjectionem potestati et jurisdictioni Ecclesiæ." Having drawn his own conclusion, Dr. Lee finishes his chapter on baptism by a "consolation" for his friends, that the supposition of unbaptized persons conferring orders frequently enough to break the apostolic succession is "an improbability so great as to be morally inconceivable." He speaks as if care in the administration of the Sacraments was the one thing of all others for which the English Church has been remarkable; as if there had been no time, of which Lingard speaks, when "it became necessary to establish for the moment a class of lay instructors, consisting of mechanics, licensed to read the service to the people in the church"; as if there had been no Commonwealth or reign of Puritanism; as if the Restoration had brought back with it times of apostolic purity and reverence, instead of deluging the kingdom with licentiousness, and forgetting even the very forms of religion; as if, in fine, the present position of what Dr. Lee would call the Catholic Church in England was not the development of our own days, but a natural inheritance handed down from father to son in every age, and in whose title-deeds no flaw or defect could by any means be traced. Would that, for the sake of the English Church, we could think so! but the whole

history of the times since the Reformation speaks too loudly to be doubted, and is too well-known to need repetition.

Dr. Lee's "doctrine of intention," too, deserves a passing notice, if only to point out its sophisms. In matters of Common Law we might bow to his decisions; but we are compelled to dissent widely from his theological reasonings. He mingles things which ought to be kept separate, and draws conclusions from premisses which have no connection with each other, insomuch that we sometimes ask in wonder if he is attempting to mislead rather than guide the readers of his book. The chapter on Intention begins by stating fairly enough the various kinds of intention, and what kind is necessary for the administration of a sacrament; then the author proceeds to apologize for the Reformation Patriarchs by saying that, with regard to their consecrations and ordinations, "We may reasonably and properly assume that they acted in good faith, unless there exist direct reasons for an opposite conclusion." So far, good. "Now, in the cases of Barlow and Scory, it has been asserted that, owing to certain loose principles which were current at the period of Parker's consecration, and which, at one period, Barlow certainly, and Scory probably, shared, they could have had no such intention in conferring holy orders, as is needful to ensure the validity of the Sacramental Act." These "loose principles," were nothing less than a denial of sacramental orders, as instituted by our Lord; and, as "Barlow certainly, and Scory probably, shared" them, the natural inference would seem to be that there do exist direct reasons for concluding that they did not act in their ordinations in good faith, and therefore had no intention of conferring the sacrament. But Dr. Lee's mind is superior to the claims of logic, where his position has to be defended coûte qui coûte, and so he replies in this manner:—"To this it may be broadly answered" (we cannot help asking if "broadly" should be interpreted "wide of the mark?") "that the unworthiness of the minister hinders not the effect of the sacraments." The proposition is sound; the only difficulty in our mind is what has it to do with the subject. We are not considering the unworthiness of the minister but his intention; and we can see no parallel between the priest who says Mass in mortal sin, to quote S. Isidore's example, and Barlow conferring orders which he scorned and disbelieved. There is between the two the world-wide difference between faith and unbelief; and it is not moral guilt which would render Barlow's ordinations null; it is his want of intention to do what the Church does, which we assume, with reason, to be the natural sequence of his avowed disbelief in orders as a sacrament. His opinions on the subject, expressed at the Windsor Conference, are too well-known to admit of doubt, and therefore the onus lies on Dr. Lee to prove that those opinions were renounced or recalled. Instead of proof, he merely affirms

that "the requisite conditions were, in all probability, complied with both by Barlow and Scory in their public official acts." How he can reconcile this assertion with what follows, viz., "that they may have held erroneous opinions regarding the sacraments in general, and ordination in particular; they may have imperfectly comprehended, or inadequately accepted, the judgment of the teaching Church;" all this we do not profess to understand any more than we can understand how, as Dr. Lee maintains, Barlow could intend to do what Christ himself enjoined, and not intend to do what the Church enjoined, since the Church speaks as the mouthpiece of her Divine Master, and under the guidance of His Spirit. Yet, in spite of his own admissions, in spite of Barlow's known opinions on the subject of orders, and the absence of all proof that he ever recanted or recalled them, Dr. Lee can coolly sum up his chapter thus,—"It is concluded that an inadequate or imperfect belief on the part of one of God's ministers for ordaining, more especially if that inadequate belief (inadequate, by the way, means *insufficient for the purpose*) is the result of an intellectual misconception, or other unfortunate defect, does not invalidate the act of ordination, which in good faith and with a virtual intention is officially performed." We have pointed out that both good faith and virtual intention were, presumably, wanting in Barlow's case; and that his argument, besides being false, is baseless in its foundation; but it would be a nice case, in these days of appeal and judgment, for the Privy Council to decide what amount of "imperfect belief," or what "intellectual misconception" or other "unfortunate defect," would render Dr. Tait incapable of conferring orders. We sadly fear that some "intellectual misconception or other unfortunate defect" was clouding Dr. Lee's mind when he penned this chapter on Intention, and that he is already sorrowing over the trite truth that "litera scripta manet."

And now, with one parting remark, we will draw this portion of our notice to an end. In the "Comedy of Convocation," Dean Primitive expresses the evangelical method of interpreting Scripture by a series of absurdly contradictory propositions—propositions which are almost too absurd to be considered possible. But if the "Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England" had been published before the Comedy, the Dean might have added Dr. Lee's testimony, when dealing with the Articles, as an instance not less absurd from the opposite side. For whereas Article XXV. declares in express terms, "Those five, commonly called Sacraments —that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction—are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel . . . . for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God," Dr. Lee, with all gravity, assures us that "Holy Orders, as the Church of England maintains, is

commonly called, and, it may be added, is rightly and properly called, a Sacrament." Risum teneatis, amici! Certainly, Dr. Lee is not happy in his logic or theology; let us see how he fares on the high road of history.

Our first investigation must regard the consecration of Barlow, since the foundation of the new hierarchy depends chiefly on the fact of his consecration. We have carefully examined and tested, as far as possible, all the evidence adduced in his favour; but it seems, to our mind, of no weight at all, since it depends on an assumption which Dr. Lee has not attempted to prove, viz., that Barlow was consecrated between April 21st and April 25th, 1535-36. His argument runs thus:—Barlow, being Bishop-elect of St. Asaph's, was elected Bishop of St. David's (he being at the time engaged on a political mission in Scotland) on April 10th, 1535-36; the royal assent was given April 20th, and Barlow was confirmed in person at Bow Church April 21st. *He must have been consecrated between April 21st and 25th*, for he obtained possession of the temporalities on April 25th. This evidence by itself deserves examination. In the first place, to accept it as true requires us to believe that the moment the election was declared, a messenger started with the news to Scotland, and that Barlow journeyed from Stirling Castle (not Edinburgh, as Dr. Lee says) to London, and that both journeys were accomplished in *ten days!* Such a travel (about 900 miles for the double journey) would be no wonder in our times of the iron horse; but considering the means and appliances of that age, it is well nigh impossible. It supposes a journey of ninety miles per day for ten successive days to render it even possible. When we consider the other circumstances, that Barlow was an ambassador, who would journey with his suite, and in great state; that there was no need for any great expedition on his part; that though the mandate for his confirmation exists, there is no word to hint even at consecration;—when all this is considered, the probabilities against the consecration become well nigh certainty. Haddon, the editor of Bramhall, saw this, and therefore admits that Barlow was not consecrated before June, and conjectures, indeed he says it is "almost certain," that the consecration took place on the same day as that of Repps to the see of Norwich, June 11th. Moreover, if the consecration occurred in April, how does it happen that Courayer, who was no lukewarm supporter of the cause, refers to a "mandate directed to Cranmer to consecrate him, dated the 24th June, 1536," and of which he offers no explanation? Finally, who is T. Meneven, mentioned in the two writs to Parliament during the time when Barlow is said to have held the see? Courayer had the wit to see how this, in an authentic document, told against his friends, and therefore wisely, we cannot say honestly, omitted all the initials. Dr. Lee, with

his usual ill-fortune, originates a theory of his own, and suggests that the scribe was deceived by the great resemblance which existed in that age between the letters T and G; and he even takes the trouble to quote in the appendix three examples from a MS. of the sixteenth century, in order to show the similarity. But, unfortunately for the theory, we find the bishops of that time called in the official documents not Gulielmus but Willielmus. For instance, Dr. Lee himself quotes the following testimonies to our assertion:—(1) in the commission dated 3rd February, 1548, for the translation of Barlow from St. David's to Bath and Wells, he is styled *several times* Will. Menev. Epis.; (2) the commission for the consecration of Robert Ferrar, Barlow's successor at St. David's, is "Per translationem Willielmi"; (3) the commission for the restoration of temporalities to Ferrar is "Per translationem Willielmi"; (4) in all the records quoted by Dr. Lee regarding the consecrations in question, there is only *one* instance of Gulielmi. This one is found in the record of Parker's consecration, kept at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; and its unique position almost tempts us to exclaim, that the exception does but serve to prove the rule.

The cumulative evidence which Dr. Lee heaps up is after all mere sound. The summons to Parliament, if urged at all, must tell against Barlow; for in the writs, both in 1536 and 1541, quoted by Rymer (vol. xiv.), the initial is T. Menev. The possession of temporalities, too, so far from proving Dr. Lee's position, tells in this instance terribly against him. For whereas in other cases consecration was required as a preliminary to possession, the grant to Barlow is an exceptional one, and runs as follows:—"Cumque Præcentor et Capitulum prædictæ Cathedralis Ecclesiæ (Menevensis), post mortem prædicti Episcopi, licentiâ nostrâ prius obtentâ, dilectum et fidelem nostrum Willielmum Barlow, nunc dictæ Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Menevensis per nos nominatum Episcopum, in suum elegerunt Episcopum et pastorem, Reverendissimus in Christo Pater Thomas Cantuar. Archiep. electionem illam acceptaverit et confirmaverit; ipsumque sic electum Episcopum prædictæ Ecclesiæ Menev. præfecerit et Pastorem sicut per litteras patentes ipsius Archiep. inde directas nobis constat; nos nunc certis de causis et considerationibus nos specialiter moventibus, et ob sinceram dilectionem quam penes præfatum nunc Episcopum gerimus et habemus de gratiâ nostrâ speciali et ex certâ scientiâ et mero motu nostris dedimus et concessimus," &c. Here, contrary to usage and precedent, the king, for causes specially moving him thereto, grants the temporalities of St. David's to Barlow when the Archbishop of Canterbury had accepted and confirmed his election by the Præcentor and Chapter. There is no mention of consecration, and no sign by which we might gather that such a thing was either done or contemplated.

And with this knowledge of how he obtained the temporalities of his see, the difficulty of his taking his seat as a spiritual peer vanishes. It is true that, as Dr. Lee argues, consecration was requisite before a bishop could take his place among the peers; yet this arose, not from the necessity of consecration, but from the fact that the temporalities, or the barony, were only given after consecration; and the bishops sat, not because they were bishops, but because they were barons of the kingdom, and the barony followed consecration. In Barlow's case, unfortunately for the Anglican hierarchy, it followed election. In order to prove this, we must quote a protest issued by William Courteney, Archbishop of Canterbury, on behalf of himself and suffragans, in 1382, when, in a Parliament held at London, the peers condemned to death certain rebel nobles. It runs as follows:—"In Dei nomine, Amen. Cum de jure et consuetudine regni Angliæ ad Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem, qui pro tempore fuerit, nec non cæteros suos suffraganeos, confratres et coepiscopos, abbatesque et priores, aliosque Prælatos quoscunque, per baroniam nostro rege tenentes, pertineat in parliamentis regiis quibuscunque, ut pares regni prædicti personaliter interesse," &c.* Here the Archbishop explains the right on which the spiritual peerage is based, viz., "per baroniam de nostro rege tenentes"; and hence it is evident that any one possessing the temporalities of a see would be entitled to take his place as a peer. Whether he had been consecrated or not made no difference: consecration was usually a necessary antecedent; but if the king chose to grant the temporalities after election and before consecration (as seems to have been done with Barlow), the lack of consecration would not prevent him from taking rank among the peers. From this, then, we can see why Barlow sat in Parliament, and how he became acknowledged as a legal bishop; but, pace Dr. Lee, we cannot conclude that he was therefore consecrated. And so the secret is as impenetrable as ever. We may pass Barlow by, confident that few would be found to endorse Dr. Lee's opinion, "that ordinary judges of evidence would at once allow the existence of a moral certainty that William Barlow was duly consecrated a bishop."

As for Parker himself, Dr. Lee gives us no new information regarding him; he simply tells what evidence there is in favour of his consecration, and omits to notice whatever has been adduced in opposition to it. How, for instance, does he reconcile with the Lambeth Register the commission in Rymer, dated Oct. 20, 1559, and signed "Per ipsam Reginam," empowering Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund, Bishop of London, and Richard, Bishop of Ely, to administer the oath of supremacy? They could not have administered the oath unless they had been at that date

* Parker, "Lives of the Archbishops," p. 401.

recognized as bishops, since Dr. Lee, attempting to prove Barlow's consecration, says "until he had been solemnly consecrated he was not a bishop in the eye of the law." But if the three named in the commission were not bishops in the eye of the law, then they were not the persons designated in the commission, and therefore could not have executed it. It is not possible to suppose that the Government were so ignorant of the law as to nominate in a commission persons who had no power to execute it; to say nothing of Parker being styled "Archbishop of Canterbury" two months before his alleged consecration. Even Dr. Lingard could only explain it away by saying that it belongs to the second, not to the first year of Elizabeth's reign. We might overturn all history if we dealt with facts in this rude way; but fortunately for our purpose the commission itself bears internal evidence that it belongs to 1559: for one of the commissioners named in it with the so-styled archbishop was Dr. William May, and his death is mentioned in Le Neve's "Fasti," and by Strype, as having occurred on Aug. 8, 1560, or two months before the date of the commission. Again, Dr. Lee makes no attempt to explain how it was that when Elizabeth designed to seize the episcopal revenues the bishops attempted to dissuade her, and offered for her acceptance out of the revenues of their sees — Canterbury, £200; Ely, £200; London, £100; Hereford, 100 marks; and Chichester 100 marks. This offer, as we gather from Strype, could not have been made later than September, and the alleged consecrations of the Register are only said to have taken place in December; and yet here are men giving away portions of their revenues some time before their alleged consecration, though proof of consecration is required before they could be instituted into them. Nor again does he attempt to deal with the difficulty that the writs in Rymer empower Parker not only to confirm, but to *consecrate* Barlow and Scory, no less than Sandys or Davys. We say nothing at present (because it is a question which affects jurisdiction and not validity) of the absurdity of the position which makes Barlow confer jurisdiction on Parker, and which makes him also receive afterwards his own jurisdiction at the hands of the man he himself had consecrated! But until these and numerous other points have been cleared up it is useless to speak of Anglican consecrations with any degree even of probability.

The argument, also, which Dr. Lee attempts to found upon the "constant tradition" to the validity of his orders would have weight, we acknowledge, if such tradition had been handed down without contradiction; but it has been contradicted by every generation, and the "Nag's head fable," judged extrinsically, carries as much weight with it as the other side. Both have been affirmed, both have been strenuously denied; and the list of

Catholics and converts to the Catholic faith which Dr. Lee quotes in his favour has less weight still. They are like the bunches left by the gatherers in the vineyard—very few; and of them we venture to affirm that several disbelieved the validity of Anglican orders. We have consulted personal friends of Dr. Hendren, and they all declare that not only did he disbelieve their validity, but he spoke of them with a contempt akin to pity. Dr. Lingard goes no further than to affirm that Parker had *a* consecration; but he does not by that admission acknowledge that the consecration was valid; on the contrary, in Note K, Vol. VII., of his "History of England," he points out that the seven sacraments of the old Church have been curtailed to two by the new Church, which, as he expresses it, "was built on the ruins of the old." Archbishop Murray, too, whom Dr. Lee brings forward, held exactly the same opinion as Dr. Lingard, for when Dr. Doyle's letter on the union of the churches drew forth such marked attention, Dr. Sadleir, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, sought an interview with the archbishop, and expressed his willingness to see the reconciliation effected. "I fear it is not easy," said Dr. Murray, "we have seven sacraments, while you have only two." And, we doubt not, additional testimony might be adduced of others whom Dr. Lee assumes to have been or to be partisans of his cause; but did they all speak as strongly and as clearly as Dr. Lee could wish them to speak—the evidence as it stands is merely Dr. Lee's interpretation of what they said—we should still cry out "Quid sunt inter tantos!" Two or three for each generation, while the opponents of Anglican claims can be numbered by hundreds. If there is a thin chain of evidence in favour of the tradition, the chain of opposition is incomparably stronger. The whole Church has never for one instant hesitated in rejecting Anglican orders, and even the men who held Dr. Lee's opinion bowed to her decision.

We cannot conclude our notice without an acknowledgment that Dr. Lee's book will do good to those who read it with minds free from prejudice. While it fails completely, as we conceive, in proving the object he had at heart; it proves also completely another thing which Dr. Lee surely never contemplated when he compiled it; it proves that the Anglican Church is, at all events, in schism. The very evidence which he adduces to support his cause shows that the English Church withdrew from the jurisdiction of its lawful superior, the Bishop of Rome, without any adequate cause or right assigned; and that she thus rent the seamless robe of Christ. Her bishops therefore were consecrated (supposing them to have had a valid consecration) illicitly, and without any lawful approbation; for, as the author of Matthew Parker's life acknowledges, he, though he was the seventieth Bishop of Canterbury, was the first and only one who was consecrated "sine

bullata approbatione papali." The state of things which was thus inaugurated has been continued by their successors, the consecrations which were unlawful in the days of Elizabeth, are unlawful still, according to the axiom " nullum tempus occurrit Ecclesiæ." No length of time gives a privilege against her rights, and those unlawful consecrations must so remain till men seek once again the only fold, and make their submission to him who sits to-day in the See where his predecessor sat in the days of Henry and Elizabeth, and who claims their obedience in virtue of the succession derived from that one to whom it was said " to thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven."

ART. VI.—THE EDUCATION BILL.

1. *A Bill to provide for Public Elementary Education in England and Wales.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 17th February, 1870.
2. *Authorized Report of the great Meeting of the Friends of Religious Education, held in S. James's Hall, London, Friday, April 8th,* 1870, *under the Presidency of the Right Hon. the Earl of Shaftesbury, &c. Also a Report of a large Conference of Schoolmasters on the Education Bill, held in the Palace Hotel, Westminster, Saturday, April 9th,* 1870. Rev. W. STANYER, M.A., General Secretary, Manchester Buildings, 116, Cheetham Hill; and, City Buildings, Corporation Street. London Offices, 18, Parliament Street, S.W.
3. *Letters to my Constituents on Popular Education.* By HENRY S. P. WINTERBOTHAM, M.P. Reprinted from the *Stroud Journal.* Higgs, Journal Office, Stroud. 1869.
4. *Popular Education at Home and Abroad.* Burns, Oates, & Co.

THAT huge omnibus, the Irish Land Bill, has at length forced its way through Temple Bar, and the next in order is the Government Education Bill. In treating at all of a subject which has changed, and may still change its aspect week by week, we write under considerable disadvantages, compared with those of our contemporaries who reflect and discuss, day by day, the changing tone of public opinion. Still, national education is the question of the day. Its settlement, one way or another, can hardly fail to affect the national happiness and welfare for centuries to come; and there is no body of men whom it can so deeply interest as it does us Catholics. Even if we should have resolved to say nothing about it, it would, of necessity, be the chief subject of our thoughts.

In our last number we reviewed the state of the question, a

little later than the second reading of the Bill. Since that, the public at large has had little attention to spare to it; but there has not been a moment in which the growl of the thunder, though distant, has not been loud enough to make itself plainly heard by the attentive ear. The loudest objections to Mr. Foster's Bill have come from the supporters of secular education. They continue to demand that their system, their whole system, and nothing but their system, shall be accepted and enforced; that is, that rate-supported schools, free to all children, and giving secular education alone, shall immediately be established for all the children of the labouring classes throughout the land, and that all who cannot be proved to be receiving a competent education elsewhere, shall be compelled to attend them. This demand is so monstrous that it would not deserve serious attention, if those who consistently urge it were not, in fact, supported by many who fundamentally differ from them in principle. Those who really desire that the children of England should be brought up wholly without religion are comparatively a handful. They do not deserve even the dubious honour of being regarded as a religious sect. But let us class them as "secularists;" and they are, at the utmost, the very smallest of the multitudinous sects into which the English people are divided. And what they demand is nothing less than that all the children of all the working classes in England, whatever and however strong may be the religious convictions of their parents, shall be compelled by law to be educated in the peculiar and distinguishing views of their own minute sect; and that all the ratepayers in England, be their own religion what it may, shall be compelled to pay for that education. Such a demand, absurd as it would be in any case, would come with much more appearance of plausibility from the Quakers or the Plymouth Brothers, not to say the Baptists or the Wesleyans, than from the secularists, both because they are more numerous, and because their opinions and principles differ less fundamentally from those of the mass of their countrymen.

What makes this demand more strikingly ludicrous is, that it professes to be made in the name and interests of religious freedom. Of course, the principle assumed is that, with regard to education at least, religious freedom is purely negative; that it is a gross violation of it that any child should be taught any dogma which its parents do not believe, or that any ratepayer should contribute towards the expense of teaching what he does not believe; but no hardship at all, either to the parent that his child should be compelled to attend a school where he is taught everything else except his own religion, or to a ratepayer, that he should contribute towards such a negative education, even of the children of parents of his own religion.

We fear we must admit that those secularists who consciously and deliberately desire to get rid of all religion are few only by comparison. Canon Consitt stated, at the Newcastle meeting of the Education Union, that "one of the advocates of the League, one of the most determined, and, I may add, violent advocates in this town, did not hesitate to say publicly, that one reason why he wished to have secular education established in this country was because he felt it would be the upsetting and the end of all Christian teaching in the land." We fear he stands by no means alone. Yet he and those who sympathize with him would be by no means formidable if they were not supported by many who would much more willingly retain Christian teaching, and who only join in opposing it because they do not see how it is to be maintained without increasing the influence of the Anglican establishment, or at least without abandoning the hope of making use of national education as an instrument for its overthrow. The leader and type of this large party is Mr. Winterbotham, a barrister of ability, who has lately become member for Stroud, and who, as the representative of the political dissenters, has already attained in the House of Commons a degree of influence very unusual in so young a member. Mr. Winterbotham, we doubt not, is a religious man, and as such really desires that the youth of England should be religious. But he believes that denominational education, if it does not strengthen the Anglican communion, will prevent the new educational system from working to its disadvantage. His demands, therefore, hardly differ from those of the League. He says:—

> I am met by a question with which I cannot help sympathizing. Why should we separate secular from religious education? Why should they not be blended as they are in the lessons of home? Why, indeed? There is but one answer. Men agree upon secular knowledge, and disagree upon religious truth (p. 33).

He is far too clear-headed to imagine, with many well-meaning men, that education can really be religious without being denominational. He therefore proposes that purely secular schools, supported by rates, should at once be provided for all children for whom sufficient means of education have not yet been provided, professing to continue on the present conditions the assistance now given from the Parliamentary grant to denominational schools. "Under this system," he says, "the denominational schools will 'still flourish,' if they continue to be supported by subscribers and parents as they are at present;" and "the secular schools will not empty or interfere with them unless (as I expect) they give a better education."

How large a proportion of Dissenters may be prepared to take Mr. Winterbotham as their leader, we cannot yet say. It is, how-

ever, already clear both that many of them do, and also that the demands of the secularists might safely be left out of practical consideration, if they were not thus supported by men who, in their hearts, prefer religious education, and only consent to give it up because they do not see how to secure it without losing an opportunity of weakening a rival body of religionists. Whenever we are met by any real danger to religion, it is always sure to result from religious divisions. If those who believe in Christ had been contented to remain in the Church He founded, they would have had nothing to fear from the opposition of others.

It is well worth notice that, although Mr. Foster's Bill demanded great sacrifices from the supporters of religious education, both in the Anglican Establishment and the Catholic Church, hardly any serious opposition to it has been made in either of those quarters. The loud opposition has been solely from the Secularists, and those Dissenters by whom they are supported. This is a strong and memorable testimony to the moderation of the other party, and to their sincere desire to see a system which shall offer the means of education to all children practically carried out. Another fact of much the same kind is that those who are so loudly protesting against any system of education which does not fully and entirely carry out their own notions, are men who have, in practice, done next to nothing for education, while the supporters of religious education, whom they wish absolutely to lay on the shelf, are the men who, for some forty years past, have been at work building schools by self-denying sacrifices and exertions, and labouring hard at teaching in them. But no sooner has Parliament expressed its purpose of establishing a national system of education, open to all the children of the land, than these Secularists, who have hitherto stood by idle, cry out, "Yes, by all means, only as to religion you must, of course, teach what we think right, and nothing else. We may be counted by tens, and those who fundamentally differ from us by millions, but we demand that they shall all give up all their wishes and views as to religious education, and that our own should be carried out whole and entire; upon this understanding and on the further understanding that we are not to be asked to subscribe a farthing towards the schools in which our views are to be taught, we are willing to give our high patronage to the scheme."

This seems absurd enough, but it must not be forgotten that when one party is loud in its demands and the opposite party nearly silent, the natural tendency of every popular Government is to make concessions to the noisy party at the cost of those who take things quietly. And hence we are far from surprised that all the concessions hitherto made by the Government have been in the direction not of religious but of secular education. The first

instalment of these concessions was contained in the amendments laid on the table by Mr. Foster just before the Whitsuntide holidays. The most important was that which, as we mentioned in our last number, had been promised by Mr. Gladstone in the debate on the second reading of the Bill—the adoption of what is called a "Time-table Conscience Clause," instead of that which at first stood in the Bill. This it is said may be so worked as not to interfere with the religious teaching and practices of schools. In Protestant schools we have no doubt it may. In Catholic schools we are sure there will, to say the least, be great risk that any such alteration will interfere with the religious observances, which, after all, do more than anything else to give the school a Catholic atmosphere. At the same time we are bound to admit that, in drawing out the proposed "Time-table Conscience Clause," Mr. Foster has done his utmost to unite the *maximum* of security against any child being taught anything to which its parents object, with the *minimum* of interference with the discipline and teaching of the school. He proposes that "the times during which any religious observance is practised, or instruction in religious subjects is given, at any meeting of the school, shall be either at the beginning or at the end, or at the beginning and the end of such meeting, and shall be inserted in a time-table to be approved by the Education Department, and to be kept permanently and conspicuously affixed in every school-room; and any scholar may be withdrawn by his parents from such observance or instruction without forfeiting any of the other benefits of the school." No doubt this is intended to meet the obvious objection that if the children who do not attend the "instruction on religious subject," were to spend the time allotted to it in play, a direct temptation would be held out to every idle child to torment its parents into withdrawing it. This of course may be prevented if the children who do not attend the religious teaching are set to some other lesson. But, so far as we see, there is nothing to prevent the "Time-table Conscience Clause" from interfering with the little religious observances, such as making the sign of the Cross and praying at the striking of the clock, which more than anything else give the school a Catholic character. There is therefore an evident danger, lest the clause now proposed should interfere with the religious teaching of the Catholic children, although intended only to protect any Protestant pupils. In this it differs seriously for the worse from the "Conscience Clause" originally proposed.

That this objection is not factiously urged by Catholics, is strikingly proved by the fact that before the alteration in the Act proposed by Government had been announced, it had been pointed out by the *Spectator*, a paper equally characterized by decided

Protestantism and by a most unusual degree of fairness in dealing with Catholics. It wrote (May 7):—

> We see no reason why the public specification of the times of formal religious teaching, and the clear separation of those times from the ordinary teaching, might not be conceded in both the new rate-founded and the old rate-aided schools alike; but that this will press very hardly on the Catholics, who profess to mingle religious worship most intimately with the ordinary teaching, and who would therefore be needlessly cut off from all aid from the rates—and logically before long also from the Privy Council—we say needlessly, because we believe that in practice Roman Catholic schools will hardly ever have a Protestant scholar in them to be protected, so that this provision will in fact simply operate to cut them off from help in prosecuting a most praiseworthy public object—the education of poor Roman Catholic children—without protecting any Protestant child's interest. Surely, if Roman Catholic schools in the Roman Catholic quarters of our great towns are well and ably taught to the satisfaction of the inspectors, and other, Protestant, schools are within reach for Protestant children, the former would deserve as much aid from the rates as the latter, in spite of their not separating the religious teaching so completely.

It is to be observed, that Mr. Foster's amendment goes beyond what the writer in the *Spectator* contemplated, and makes this "Time-table Clause" an indispensable condition, not only of aid from the rates to a denominational school, but for the continuance of any aid from the Parliamentary grant.

The next considerable concession promised by Mr. Foster was that, whereas the School Boards were to be appointed by the town council in a borough, and by the vestry in a parish, he now proposed that the appointment shall be made by the parishioners voting by ballot, and every ratepayer having an equal vote.

Lastly, whereas Mr. Foster originally proposed to enact that the Government inspectors should not examine the religious learning of the children except at the desire of the school managers, and with the consent of the Educational Department, the amendments made the prohibition absolute. This also is a concession to the Dissenters and Secularists, both of whom complained that if inspectors paid by the State were allowed, as has hitherto been the case, to test the religious knowledge of the children, that was a distinct payment by the State to religion, which, on their principles, is an abomination. Practically this amendment can affect only the schools of the Established Church, in which alone the inspectors have hitherto been allowed to examine the religious knowledge of the children. In Catholic schools and those of the dissenting bodies, the inspectors, although chosen from the same religious body, and more or less with its concurrence, have been strictly confined to secular subjects.

It seems to have been understood on both sides that the Government were ready favourably to consider other amendments in Committee, although these were all of any importance which they themselves proposed to make.

The amendments, of which notice has been given by different members, are nearly three hundred. It would therefore be almost impossible, as it is quite needless, to go through them all. Mr. Dixon, chairman of the League, has put on the paper notice of amendments, (1) to require that a "School Board" shall be elected in every school district; (2) to forbid the teaching of any "creed, catechism, or tenet peculiar to any sect" in any school provided by a School Board, allowing, however, that the Holy Scriptures may be read after, or before, school hours (no child being required to attend); and that the Board "may grant the use of the building for giving religious instruction out of school hours, provided that no preference is shown to any sect," but "may not grant it for religious worship," and also to require that such schools shall be free. With regard to the existing denominational schools, to which the Act as it stands enables the School Boards to grant aid out of the rates, provided that it is granted on equal terms to the schools of all denominations, he proposes to add the conditions that they shall henceforth be purely secular and absolutely free, and that the building shall never be used for religious worship—in a word, that these are in future not to differ in any respects from the schools to be provided by the Boards.

Mr. Vernon Harcourt proposes some amendments, the chief of which is, that the religious teaching in all schools established or aided by the rates shall be "undenominational and unsectarian."

Mr. Winterbotham proposes that the existing denominational schools may continue to receive aid from the Parliamentary Grant on condition of adopting the Time-table Conscience Clause, &c.; but that they are not to receive any assistance from the Education Rate except on condition of being changed into purely secular schools, such as he proposes to make the schools to be established by the School Boards.

With regard, therefore, to the proposed system of education, the struggle which is prominently going on has been, and is, between those who wish that it should be at least in the main "denominational," and those who are wishing to make it merely "secular," although among this last party there are many who desire, and perhaps expect, that religious teaching will still be given to the children, although not in the "National Schools" or during school hours. In writing for Catholics it is hardly necessary to prove that, even if it were so given, it would by no means meet the necessities of the case; but it may be worth while to say, that the expectation is utterly chimerical. The great

mass of the children for whose benefit a national system is now demanded are now utterly neglected and uncared for. Yet, there is certainly no one of them, at least in our great towns, who could not be sent to a day school, or, at the very least, to Sunday school, if its parents really cared about it. Why, then, are they not sent? Mr. Winterbotham himself answers:—"Partly, perhaps, owing to the poverty of the parents, but far more commonly to a selfish and criminal indifference on the part of the parent to the highest interest of the child."* Is it not plain, then, that, under a system such as he proposes, in which secular teaching is to be compulsory and religious education voluntary, all these children will be left utterly without it?

We have never had any fear that these extreme proposals will be carried in England, at least for years to come. What we have feared is some compromise which would be scarcely less fatal. The *Spectator*,† after examining Mr. Foster's concessions, says:—

> If it were held sufficient to provide that the rate-provided schools shall in any case be (as regards religious teaching) whatever the majority really wish; and that all schools whatever receiving public aid, whether originally provided by public or private means, shall be fully available on all *other* subjects than religion, for those who do not like the religious teaching, we cannot imagine how such a design could be more perfectly and effectually worked out. We hold it, however, to be quite clear that this is not all that the country desires; nor, indeed, in our opinion, all that is intrinsically desirable.

The writer demands that in rate-built schools the use of any distinctive creed or formulary be absolutely prohibited, but that the teachers should be left at liberty to express "their own views as far as they find that essential to their efficiency as teachers." The effect of this, he thinks, will be that the masters will see "that the object of a religious lesson in a public school attended by the children of persons of all shades of opinion, should be to inculcate common principles as much as possible, and disputed opinions as little as possible—to avoid every sign of the triumph of one faith over another; to unite, not to divide." It adds, "we cannot therefore see anything but pure advantage in excluding from rate-built schools every distinctive formulary, and so warning the master, that though he is left free to express his own character and heart, this is not for the sake of any controversial purpose, but solely to avoid hampering him by rigid rules, incapable of satisfactory definition." The *Times*, June 16th, takes the same line. This view is natural; indeed, unavoidable when a man who really cares about religion at all sets himself seriously to frame a

* Speech at Stroud, June 8. † May 28.

system of "public schools to be attended by the children of persons of all shades of opinion." If such schools must exist, it would probably be the least mischievous form into which they could be cast. For all religious men will feel, what the new Bishop of Exeter has very well and forcibly expressed, that by far the most important influence in education is "the atmosphere which surrounds an earnestly religious man." In fact, this is worth in itself far more than any formularies, or any rules requiring the reading of prayers in school. Who can doubt, for instance, that Dr. Arnold, although in many respects he held much less religious truth than the mass of head-masters for a century before his time, exerted a greater religious influence on his pupils than all of them put together, simply because there was a something about him which made it impossible for any one of them to doubt that he really loved and feared God and our Lord Jesus Christ. But it is certain that if the lips of teachers are to be closed upon all questions of real and vital moment; if (to take one instance) a teacher who is asked by his pupil the question put by S. Philip to our Blessed Lord, namely, "How it is, now that He is gone into Heaven, that He manifests Himself to His own people, as He does not to the world," is bound, whether by a positive rule or by an honourable understanding, to answer, "You must not ask me about that; I am not at liberty to tell you,"—the result will be that religious men will not undertake the office, and we shall have for our school teachers only the residuum—the men who are not fit for any other occupation, or who are willing to tell their pupils nothing bearing upon Almighty God, and the soul, because, in truth, they do not themselves care about such things. Thus, Lord Salisbury said,* "These men are for setting up a pagan system, to be enforced by pagan teachers." And when some of his audience met him with cries of "No, no," he continued,—"Yes, I say so, for this reason. There are people who are accustomed to refer their own motives and objects in life to a higher authority—to look to the supernatural, and to seek their reward beyond this world; and, if they be true to themselves, they cannot try to influence others in any spirit but that which influences themselves. And if you call upon a teacher to influence those whom he teaches, upon the principle of a secular and pagan system entirely excluding religion, you will get none but men who do not care about religion."

This argument is so strong, and has been so much felt, even by the strongest advocates of secular education, that even Mr. Dixon said,† "The League had no wish to prevent teachers from making any incidental allusions to religion when a proper occasion might require it during the day."

---

* National Education Meeting, April 8.
† Schoolmasters' Conference, April 9.

And hence the compromise just now in fashion is to demand that national education shall be "religious, but unsectarian." This is the principle advocated by the *Times*, and however little we may think of the qualifications of the *Times* to judge of a religious question, there is no doubt that it has special means of knowing how public opinion is turning, and takes very good care how it commits itself to a cause not likely to win. On June 16th, the feast of Corpus Christi, it devoted a whole leading article to the question. It asks—

> Is there no escape from the legitimate conclusion that schools supported from all sorts of creeds must teach no religion at all, and be as absolutely secular as the very small minority of "Secularists" pure and simple would desire?

Then it asks—

> Putting the Secularists, and we suppose also the Roman Catholics, out of the question, cannot "all who profess and call themselves Christians" agree on some simple basis and first beginning of Christian knowledge for the poor children cast upon our common charity? Secularism, with lessons in religion from the clergy of different denominations, is what we must come to if the religious folks cannot hit upon a compromise which will do everything in the same rooms, and, as far as possible, with the same teachers.

What this proposal assumes as its first principle is, that the different religious sects whom it invites to unite are kept asunder, not by real differences of faith, not because one holds and the other denies doctrines, the knowing and believing which really affect the condition of man, but only by social and political quarrels and grievances, by scorn on one side and envy on the other. For no one could seriously invite religious men to sacrifice the teaching of doctrines which they believed it necessary for the children to learn. Unfortunately, we believe that what it assumes is substantially true. We say "unfortunately" because this tendency to amalgamation among our Protestant sects is one of the most deadly symptoms of mortal disease at their very heart. It is, in fact, the last symptom of a dying religion. The history of all heresies is that they begin with maintaining with enthusiastic earnestness and violence some dogma, generally in itself true, but perverted into heresy by being exaggerated and taken by itself, to the exclusion of other counterbalancing truths, side by side with which it stands in the Catholic Faith. For a while the new heretics are ready alike to slay or be slain for their distinguishing dogma. But when they have been formed into a sect, their fanaticism cools down little by little. They begin to doubt and qualify this doctrine and that, and having no authority to which to appeal, and no Divine Faith to retain unmutilated, they become, in a few genera-

tions, indifferent to all religious truth, and at last even to the doctrine, whatever it was, for the sake of which they originally abandoned the Church. Look, for example, at the Lutherans. Their heresiarch abandoned the Catholic Faith for the sake of his own peculiar view of "justification by faith only." He founded a mighty sect, which still exists, indeed, separate from the Church, but divided from it, not by holding that peculiar dogma, but by rejecting all dogmas as such. Again, among those who abandoned the Catholic Faith for Luther's new doctrine, a mortal feud, as all the world knows, immediately sprang up. The two parties, Lutheran and Reformed, as they were called, were divided upon several vital points, specially on the doctrine of the Eucharist. It is certainly no exaggeration to say that Luther and the early Lutherans, much as they hated the doctrine of the Church, hated much more bitterly the teaching of Calvin and Zwingle. Yet King Frederick William III. of Prussia was able to unite the two into one sect, not because either of them had converted the other, but because both had really ceased to believe or care about any doctrine at all. Now, the Protestant sects of England once differed from each other most heartily. The Baptists, for instance, maintained that baptism was necessary, and that no baptism was valid except that given by immersion after the recipient had come to the age of reason. They therefore excluded from their communion, not only members of the other sects, but even such Baptists as, thinking this uncharitable, admitted them.* Now, so completely has doctrine died out, that Mr. Winterbotham, no bad judge, declares—

> I would put it to any man who has heard as many sermons as I have, whether, if he went to a Baptist, a Presbyterian, an Independent, or a Wesleyan chapel, he could tell me, at the end of twelve months, to which sect it belonged.†

Of course this implies that both parties have ceased really to believe that Baptism, for instance, is of any real importance at all. The Baptist, if asked, would, we presume, say that the members of the other sects are unbaptised. He and they however really agree, because they all think that, whether a man is baptised or not, does not matter a straw. No great wonder, then, that the religious teaching they give their children is really and substantially the same. In most (we believe not all) Church of England schools

---

* The witty Rowland Hill was one day at a Baptist meeting, and when what Dissenters call "the ordinance" was about to be celebrated (*i.e.* the taking bread and wine), the "Deacon" came to him with evident reluctance, saying, "I am sorry, Mr. Hill, that you cannot sit down at our table." He replied, "Dear me, I beg your pardon; I was under a mistake. I thought it was the Lord's Table."

† Speech at Stroud.

the words of the "Church Catechism" are still taught as a routine task. There also are, we believe, some catechisms taught in most Dissenting schools; but the moment they get rid of the exact words of the formularies they are all agreed. The religion common to the mass of the Established Church (the Ritualists of course are an exception), to the Wesleyans, Independents, Baptists, &c., is, in few words, that the Bible is the Word of God; that the soul of man is immortal; that Christ is the Saviour of the world; that work or amusement on the Sabbath (meaning Sunday) is one of the greatest of sins; and that the Catholic Church is anti-Christ. We greatly doubt whether there is any other point of agreement. This is practically the religion taught in the mass of Church of England and Dissenting schools, and hence we maintain (as we did in our number for January) that the real difference between Church and Dissenting schools is not so much what is taught in them, as by whom it is taught; *i.e.*, the Church school brings its children under the influence of the clergyman and his family and Sunday-school teachers; the Dissenting school under the influence of the Dissenting minister and his deacons, &c. &c. We have since seen a curious confirmation of this in the report of Mr. Pryce, the inspector of Church of England schools in Mid-Wales.* He says:—

> I am persuaded that in the majority of cases the clergyman would be satisfied if he were entrusted with the management of the school, and that he would take the same interest in it as he does at present, although the teaching were purely secular. The conviction has been forced upon me that the government of the school, and not the amount of religious instruction given, is what many of the Welsh clergy care most for.

The fact is, that in our day the distinction between the Established Church and the mass of the so-called orthodox Dissenters (*i.e.*, all except the Socinians) is not a religious but a social distinction, and there is nothing in which this is more felt than in the education question. The *Spectator* says the Dissenters' feeling—

> Is wholly grounded upon a jealous sectarian view, apart from the interests of the children. It is a question of flags, not a question of conscience. "Their rates will in many cases go to support" a good school, with full protection indeed against any proselytism, but still a good school under the Church flag; whereas what they would desire would be to send their children to what they think an equally good or better school under a Dissenting flag, or, in a word, in such a case as we have supposed, they would pay what went to enhance the glory of the Church instead of the glory of Dissent.—(March 5.)

Elsewhere it admits:—It was only right and just that the social arrogance and exclusiveness with which our national Church and its members have been

---

* Quoted by Mr. Winterbotham, Letters to Constituents, p. 38.

so frequently chargeable, should now recoil upon us and make the satisfactory settlement of one of the greatest questions of the day difficult to the point of extreme hazard. For the Church it is impossible to say anything except that it has been guilty of the social exclusiveness which is now causing so much soreness of feeling, although, day by day, that absurd caste feeling is dying away, and may, before very long, as we may well hope, be altogether extinct.—(March 19.

In this state of feeling it is, so far as we can see, chiefly the fact of the Establishment which keeps the different Protestant sects from combining into one creedless body, or at least from mutually recognizing each other as equals, and whenever the Establishment question is set at rest, either by disendowment or by the entire abolition of tests and acts of uniformity, so that all sects may have an equal right to enjoy the endowments, we see no solid reason why the mass of English Protestants may not come to this mind. Meanwhile it is impossible not to see that the school-masters of the different sects, between whom this social distinction is much less strongly marked, have already arrived at it. On April 9th a conference took place "between a number of Liberal members of Parliament, who have taken a prominent part in the education discussion, and a large body of metropolitan school teachers belonging to the Church, British, and Wesleyan School Associations." One of the questions put to the teachers was, "Is it practicable to inculcate the moral precepts contained in the Bible used as a school-book, without making any reference to sectarian things, so that the school should remain utterly unsectarian"? Answers were given. All who spoke were of one mind, that there was no real difference between their teaching, and that the "religious difficulty" was merely imaginary. Mr. Lawson, secretary to the London Association of Church Teachers, said, "So far as Scripture lessons were concerned, there was little, if any, difference between the teaching in Church, Wesleyan, and British schools." "The teacher read a passage of Scripture, and explained it without intruding points of distinctive doctrine." Mr. Ryder, a British school teacher for nearly forty years, said that in his "Bible lesson the greatest care was taken that nothing should be sectarian. The Bible was not used to draw from it creeds and tenets peculiar to different denominations, but as a book whose lessons should fit the children to pass through life as good members of society, and also prepare them for that eternal world into which they must enter. He carefully abstained from any dogmatic theology, and was sure that the children themselves, or their parents, would be unable to say from his teaching to what denomination of Christians he himself belonged. . . . He felt sure that if this kind of Bible teaching were honestly and faithfully pursued in our schools, there would be no need of a conscience-clause at all. . . .

He had at one time nine per cent. of Roman Catholics, and twenty-nine per cent. of Church of England scholars, though this was professedly a Dissenting school. He had had children of infidels, one of whom was an infidel lecturer, who said he wished his two boys should be brought up in a knowledge of the Bible." Mr. Hellier, of the Church Schools, Lambeth, spoke in the same tone, saying, for instance, that "He believed all teachers, whether British, Church, or Wesleyan, thought more of Christian morality than of dogma." Upon this Mr. Dixon, M.P., asked what he meant by denominational teaching"? Mr. Hellier replied that "by Bible teaching he meant explaining the Bible, and dealing with those great truths which are the common ground on which all Christians stand; denominational teaching he understood to be, drawing out from the Bible, and making prominent that which supported or explained the dogmas of any denomination." We might give pages of extracts of the same character. What makes this more remarkable is, that these masters "unanimously" repudiated the idea that they could be satisfied with merely reading the Scriptures without explanation, which they declared "would be a farce," and rejected by a unanimous vote the proposal of a "Time-table Conscience-Clause." Mr. Grove, of All Souls' National School, Langham Place, said that if it meant "having a certain notified time for religious instruction, it was practicable, and had been carried out by himself and others in large and small schools; but it was generally understood that this conscience-clause meant also that the teacher's mouth would be shut upon religious topics, for the whole of the school hours, except that specified upon the time-table. . . . . The great object should be to make religion permeate the whole life of a child, and become the mainspring of his actions; but this object would be unattained if the master were forbidden to open his mouth upon religious subjects during the greater part of the day. At the end of the meeting "The Right Hon. W. F. Cowper-Temple, who was not present at the commencement of the proceedings, asked those teachers who would be satisfied with the mere reading of the Bible without expounding it to hold up their hands. No one did so. But they unanimously replied in the affirmative [to the question] whether they would be satisfied with 'Bible teaching' as defined during the conference, avoiding doctrinal points."

A man who knows anything of the tone of schoolmasters in France or Germany must feel that there is much to rejoice and give thanks at in such a scene as this. We are fully convinced that these men say what they feel, when they declare that education must, before all things, be religious; and also that the mere reading of the Bible in the school would not be, in any sense, religious education, and not less so when they declare that it is

easy to give religious education "without teaching any dogma," and "avoiding all doctrinal points." Strange and paradoxical as the latter notion seems at first sight, it is by no means confined to schoolmasters. In fact, it is, just now, the popular, nay, almost universal feeling of religiously-minded laymen in England. Mr. Vernon Harcourt, himself son of a dignitary of the Church of England, and grandson of an archbishop, not only declared his own belief in it, but engaged to prove it to the House of Commons (debate, June 16th). The day on which he gave this remarkable pledge was the feast of Corpus Christi; it is impossible not to think how two schoolmasters, one Catholic, the other Protestant, could give "undenominational" instruction on religious subjects on such a day, that day avoiding all doctrinal points. Mr. Gladstone confined himself to saying, what was enough for his object, that he did not know how to define in an Act of Parliament what was and what was not "denominational" and "sectarian." But we have little doubt that the majority even of the House, and certainly the majority of the country, are in this matter with Mr. Vernon Harcourt and the schoolmasters, not with the Premier. A conviction so general among a practical people like the English must have some real meaning, however confusedly that meaning may be held and expressed.

And from this feeling it is that the Secularists derive their only real strength. The mass of those who stand by them would recoil with horror from what they really mean, viz., that children should be brought up with no religion at all. So much do they themselves feel this that, as a general rule, they confine themselves to vague terms, which do not express what they really want, protests against "denominational" or "sectarian" teaching, and the like; and we are confident that not one man in a hundred among those who attend their meetings, and vote,—nay, even speak in support of their resolutions, have, like Mr. Winterbotham, clearness of head and knowledge of the subject sufficient to know, that what this really means is the exclusion of all religious teaching altogether. The *Spectator* thinks that this fear of saying what they mean is the real cause of the exceptional bitterness shown by the Secularists at the present moment. They are in the annoying position of men who have put themselves so prominently forward that they must say what they want, and who yet dare not speak out. If they openly and decidedly demanded that no religion at all should be taught, they would at once lose all their followers. If they do not, their demands become inconsistent and unreal. And so, as we have seen, while pressing for merely secular education, even Mr. Dixon says that they "have no wish to prevent teachers from making any incidental allusions to religion." What takes place at most of the public meetings of this party is really amusing.

The resolutions are, for the most part, "cut and dried"; and, to do the gentlemen on the platform justice, they usually move and second them, each in his turn with a degree of regularity which shows how resolved they are to support their party. But listen to the speeches. Half of them, at least, are to say that education must and shall, before all things, be really religious; and to declare that such an education may be given without meddling with controversial subjects. That is all that they want. Mr. Winterbotham, to do him justice, sees very clearly what this really means. He said at the Stroud Meeting (at which the speeches were exactly of this character) "Our Chairman [Mr. Marling, M.P. for West Gloucestershire] says, 'Let us have undenominational teaching—such teaching as we can agree upon.' By all means; if we can agree upon religious education, have it. But how if we don't? Now, do we?" And then, answering the objection, that in the British schools such a system is actually adopted, he said, that those who support these schools are really only the Low Church party of the Established Church, the Baptists, Independents, Wesleyans, and other Methodists, but that it could not be stretched beyond them. If it were, the new wine would break the bottles. "The Unitarians have seceded from it. I do not think you could make it satisfactory to a consistent and logical Churchman. The Roman Catholics would have nothing to do with it. It comes, then, to this, that people who really do not differ at all would manage to sink their differences." This is the simple truth.

On the whole, then, we have watched, though not without anxiety, yet with thankfulness, the turn taken by this controversy. It has proved what we always believed, that although English Protestantism has so far entered upon its last stage, that the theological disputes by which it was originally divided already appear to most Protestants matters of no moment; they are still far from the state at which German, and we fear French, Protestantism long ago arrived, and to which they themselves are inevitably tending—a state in which everything that can be called religion has utterly died out. And this confirms a conviction at which we long ago arrived, and which we here desire to record. We are satisfied that whatever degree of success the Secularists may obtain in Parliament, whatever law may be passed (and we are far from denying the great danger of laws passing which may do great mischief), still, neither secular nor yet undenominational education will really and practically be carried out in England. How the working of the law will be evaded, through what gap the well-known coach-and-four will be driven, we do not undertake to predict. But, that some gap will be found, and that neither undenominational religious education, nor yet secular education will practically work in England, we are as sure as we can be of the

result of any conceivable experiment. This conviction is founded not on theory, but experience. The experiment has been tried; for instance, in Prussia. If ever there was a country in which it was likely to succeed, that country was Prussia, because submission to a central authority, regulating by something like military discipline all the affairs of life, was never carried farther. The law and the administration long enacted that mixed schools should everywhere be worked. Yet although the schools were maintained at public cost, and although education was compulsory, it was found, first, that in practice very few of the schools were really mixed; and next, that as far as they were so, the results had been in all respects bad. In so much that the attempt has now been given up, and although the law still allows a district to establish a mixed school, if such is the desire of the inhabitants, such schools are now never set up, and those which formerly existed are almost daily changed into denominational schools. Her Majesty's Commissioners reported last year—"a general conviction among all practical men, that the denominational school is the only school that is at present possible in Germany."*

In Holland and the United States secular (not undenominational) education is established by law, but it seems by the same report unlikely to be long maintained in operation. In Canada, although there is a system of secular education, it has already been found necessary to give the greatest facilities for the establishment of denominational schools, and they are rapidly spreading. In Ireland, where a system professedly mixed was established in 1832, it has never been carried out. So far as it has worked well it has worked by being made really and practically denominational; so far as it is mixed it has worked so ill that the report delivered a few days ago by her Majesty's Commissioners, proposes that the attempt should be given up.

In a word, there is no one country in the world in which undenominational religious education has ever really worked, and

---

* Besides the valuable pamphlet, "Popular Education at Home and Abroad," which we have placed at the head of this article, we would specially refer our readers to a very valuable one published, we think, three years ago, by a Protestant gentleman who knows Prussia well, entitled "The Church of Rome under Protestant Governments," in which a very curious and instructive contrast is drawn, between the system adopted by the English Government in Ireland, and that adopted by the Prussian Government in its Catholic provinces. The difference, in one word, is this—the two Governments have proposed to themselves different objects. The object of the Prussian Government has been to make its Catholic subjects good, well-educated, and valuable citizens and soldiers. The object of the English Government has been, to adopt Archbishop Whately's expression, "to undermine the religion of the Irish." With these different objects in view it is not wonderful that very different means have been employed.

most assuredly if there is one people on earth among whom it is unlikely to work, it is the people of England, because there is none in which it is more opposed to the national habits, manners, and institutions, which are beyond anything else "denominational," and because there is none, among whom it is more hopeless to carry out by law any institution opposed to the popular sentiment. *Quid leges sine moribus* is indeed a maxim of universal appreciation. But if it had never applied anywhere else it would have been the characteristic of the English people. From all this we infer, without hesitation, that although at this moment the popular cry is for "religious but undenominational education," yet the vast majority of those who raise it really mean the first half of what they say, and do not at all understand the absurdity of the last half; and we think, in fact, as it has been well expressed, that "religious Protestants care much more for the truths which they believe than for the nonsense which they only talk;" and we feel confident that the national system to be set up in obedience to this demand, if it works at all, will very soon be found to work (more or less satisfactorily) as a denominational system of one sort or another.

And this brings us to the consideration of the additional changes which, while this article has been in progress, Mr. Gladstone has proposed in the Government Bill.

He began by declaring that the Government could not accede to Mr. Vernon Harcourt's proposal, that religious instruction should be given in the schools to be provided by the rates, but that nothing should be taught characteristic of any denomination. In order to carry out such a law he must settle what undenominational religious teaching is; and this could only be done, either by "constituting a new religious code, by Act of Parliament, by a process of excision and amputation," or else by conferring Papal authority upon the Educational Department. Of course he might have added that neither plan could by possibility work. He then stated what he considered to be the essential principles of the Bill. First, that the national revenue was to be applied only for secular results; next, that the machinery of voluntary schools should be employed as far "as it was available for our purpose;" thirdly, that the principle of rating should be adopted only "by way of supplementing the gap left by the voluntary schools." To manage this local School Boards, chosen by free popular election, were to be empowered to erect schools, either secular or "with such degrees of religious teaching as they might in their judgment find best suited to the wants of the particular district they happen to represent. They were also empowered to give aid from the rates to the voluntary schools of the district, subject only to the condition, that in order to check the action of undue religious prejudice, they

must give to all or none, and not make a selection between them." He did not propose to modify the principles of the measure. Upon the point of "local discretion," however, *i.e.* the large powers proposed to be given to the School Boards, his views "had not been altogether realized." Then after going through the different objections raised, he said that Government now proposed that in the schools to be founded by the Boards, their discretion should be thus far limited, that although they may still found purely secular schools, or schools in which any degree or kind of religion should be taught, it must be subjected to this limitation, viz., that "no catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught." Next, with regard to the "voluntary schools," Mr. Gladstone saw that difficulties and inconveniences would arise in the working of the clause which enabled the School Boards to give to them aid from the rates, especially in consequence of "acrimony" with which the Roman Catholic schools would be regarded in the local boards. There would be danger of perpetual contests and frequent changes in the balance of opinion, in the Boards, by which assistance voted by one Board might be stopped by their successors. It seemed important, however, that there should be some prospect of permanence in the assistance thus granted,—permanence, that is, "not from generation to generation, but from year to year." To meet these difficulties, Mr. Gladstone proposed that the School Boards should have nothing to do with the voluntary schools, leaving them connected merely with the Educational Department of Government and dependent for public aid only on the Parliamentary Grant. But in doing this, "we must fulfil the engagements we have already entered into with the voluntary schools. We have held out, and I think, in every scheme of education that has been propounded, it has been held out, that in the competition with the rate-schools, they should receive some assistance towards lightening the burden of their expenditure." This he proposed to fulfil by increasing the allowance from the Parliamentary Grant. It must not however be so far increased as to infringe the principle of limiting it to secular results, *i.e.* aid given by Government to any voluntary school must fall short of what it would cost to maintain an equally good merely secular school. He proposes therefore to augment the grant to be given to schools (whether voluntary or founded by the rate), to a sum not to exceed one-half of the total cost. At the same time he proposes for the future not to make grants from the Privy Council towards the building, but only towards the annual expenses of schools.

Lastly, Mr. Gladstone threw out a hint that the year of grace, as it has been called, given to the friends of voluntary schools to supply the existing deficiency, after the amount of that deficiency

had been ascertained, might, perhaps, be curtailed. On this subject, however, he did not speak positively, and we cannot but hope that he will reconsider it. The curtailment of this year would be a most serious violation of his own "vital principle," that the deficiency is to be supplied, "if possible," by voluntary schools. In fact, there are the strongest possible reasons for extending it—say to two years or, at the very least, eighteen months.

Such, then, is the Government measure as it now stands. Supposing it to pass as it stands, its practical working (so far as it is given us to foresee what is future) would be first to stimulate the activity of those interested in education, by which we may reckon that a large proportion of the actual deficiency of schools will be supplied before the time comes (say eighteen months hence) at which School Boards can be called into operation. The School Boards, when constituted, will be required to supply the remainder. They will not have the power to apply any part of the rate in aid of the voluntary schools, which some men likely to guess right had been inclined to expect would have been their principal function if the Bill had passed in its original form. They will, therefore, be required to supply the deficiency (whatever it may be) by founding new schools. We do not see that the character of these schools is likely to be materially different from that which any schools founded by the School Boards under the original Bill would have had. The general feeling of the classes from which the Boards are likely to be taken is, at the present moment, so strongly in favour of religious but undenominational education, that we expect they will try to carry out that ideal. The mass of the new schools in that case will be, in theory, what the British Schools now are. In practice much will depend on the character of the masters appointed to them, and on the degree to which the clergy and other members of the Established Church are allowed and willing to take an active part in their administration and teaching. Dissenters are so numerous in the great towns that we incline to think they will preponderate on the School Boards; and if they do, we do not see why the mass of the new schools should not be exactly what the British Schools now are. At the same time, should the members of any School Board be out-and-out Church of England men, they may, without the least difficulty, make the new schools quite as decided Church of England schools as any of those now existing. The only limit to their power will be the rule which forbids the "Church Catechism" to be taught in the school. They may appoint what master they please; and he may, as often as he pleases, refer to, quote, and illustrate religious matters by reference to it and to the "Common Prayer Book." The Board, again, might most easily throw the whole of the social influence of the

school into the hands of the clergyman. On the whole, therefore, we see no reason why the schools to be provided out of the rate should not be very much what they would have been if the Bill had passed in its original shape; and as far as we can see, the great mass of them would, in that case, have been "British,"—a few, probably, "Church of England" schools.

Thus far, then, the change now proposed will be unfavourable to denominational education; for while the rate-founded schools will probably be much what they would have been without it, the encouragement which might have been expected from the aid given by the School Boards to voluntary schools will be cut off.

Against this, however, must be set the increased aid to be given by the Privy Council to voluntary schools. It has hitherto been calculated that, under the revised code, the annual cost of a school wholly satisfactory to the Government inspectors might be divided into three equal portions: one-third being met by the Government grant, one-third by the payments of the children, the remaining third by voluntary contributions. Of this last third, one half may now be granted by the Privy Council; so that the result will be that three-sixths (or half the total expense) will be paid by the Government grant, two-sixths (or one-third) by the children, and one-sixth by voluntary subscriptions. There is no doubt that this will be an important stimulus to voluntary schools; and Mr. Gladstone throughout assumed that it was to be extended to such voluntary schools as may hereafter be founded, as well as to those already existing when the School Board begins its operations. It is also to be remembered that as the voluntary schools will not be in any degree dependent on local taxation, while the schools supported by the Board will draw from the rates one-sixth of their annual expenses, as well as the whole cost of their erection, the natural tendency of the ratepayers will be to encourage voluntary schools, and in one way or another to get rid, as far as they can, of those connected with the School Boards.*

---

* The *Times* evidently pushes this a great deal too far. It says (June 18):—"When two systems run side by side, one must have the pull. Can it be doubted which of these two will outbid the other in the struggle for existence? The denominational school will appear under a double advantage. Half the cost of maintenance being refunded by the State, in addition to subscriptions, it can offer education at *a cheaper rate*, and it will be freed from the apparent odium of adding to the local rates." This article is written throughout in a spirit of hostility to denominational schools, which the writer declares "the voice of the nation rejects," and that "the agitation of the last two or three months has been one continual protest against the spread" of such schools. This is not surprising, as the *Times* has warmly advocated the figment of "undenominational religious schools," and naturally wishes to get rid of the denominational schools to make room for them. How little the writer attempted to be fair is proved by his saying,

On the whole we incline to think that the practical working of the Bill, if carried as it now stands, will be, that in the great towns, schools practically dissenting and not much different from those now called "British," will be set up to supply whatever deficiency may remain, say eighteen months hence, and that the Church of England and Catholic schools will be more numerous and more efficient than ever.

If, therefore, the Dissenters, who have lately made a loud cry for national education, really desire only that the means of obtaining secular education should be provided for all children, leaving all parents free to have their own children instructed in their own religion as they think best, we do not see how they can manage to find fault with the amended Bill. For, unless we are mistaken, its working will be, that in the great towns, where Dissenters are numerous, schools practically dissenting will be provided and maintained out of the rate, without any cost to the Dissenters; while Church of England and Catholic schools must be wholly provided by voluntary efforts, and when provided, must have recourse to them for one-sixth at least of their annual expenses. We do not see the fairness of this. But it is only an illustration of what often happens under our Parliamentary government, that a party loud in its complaints gets more than its fair share. Under such circumstances one can hardly wonder that the cry goes on even when there is nothing left to complain of, and, indeed, when the complainers have received much more than justice. This, we fear, may be the case in the present instance. The reception of the Bill in the House of Commons, on June 10th, was not encouraging. Mr. Dixon protested against any increased support to denominational schools, and Mr. Disraeli made an attack as clever as

---

the voluntary schools "can offer education at a cheaper rate," because "half the cost of their maintenance is to be refunded by the State, in addition to subscriptions," the proposal being that the State shall give the same to both classes of schools, but that those of the School Board are to make up the deficiency (always more than half the total cost) by rates, the others by voluntary subscriptions. Of course the rate of payment must be the same in both; and it will be the duty of the Educational Department to see that it is so, otherwise the Boards whose schools cost them nothing may very probably attempt to empty the voluntary schools by underselling them. It is specially provided in the Act (section 24) that the "Board may pay the whole or any part of the school fees payable by any child resident in their district whose parent is, in their opinion, unable from poverty to pay the same; but no such payment shall be made or refused on condition of the child attending any public school other than such as may be selected by the parent." This clause was evidently added expressly to prevent the School Board from bidding to attract the children of the poor from the voluntary schools. One can only hope it may not be evaded; and we must trust to the Education Department to prevent their using the power of "remitting payment" given by clause 17 to the same purpose.

usual, and, we should think, as ill-judged as any. He was bidding apparently for the support of the more extreme section of the Liberal party to aid him in overturning Mr. Gladstone's administration. But after the exposure of that policy, and of its effects upon the interests of the Conservatives, by Lord Salisbury, in the *Quarterly Review* last October, we incline to doubt whether he will obtain the support of his party in his attempt. A very short time will show. In reviewing what has hitherto passed we still think that Parliament, instead of leaving it to the School Boards to determine the religious character of the schools—a proposal with which no party has been satisfied (as Mr. Gladstone admits)—should have required that the report by which the amount of school deficiency is to be measured should also specify, as far as it can be ascertained, the religion professed by the parents of the children for whom schools are needed. And if the School Boards had then been required to provide, under the control of the Educational Department, schools of such religious character as would as far as possible meet the wants of the numbers thus ascertained. No one, of course, would wish that in an agricultural village containing, say, a hundred children of the Established Church, twenty Dissenters, and five Catholics, separate schools should be provided for each. These cases can only be met imperfectly; and we do not see how they could be better met than by a "conscience clause." But it is not with such cases that we have practically to do; the real case to be provided for is that of the crowded districts of our great towns. And in them there could be no real difficulty in ascertaining the number of children of each religion for whom schools had to be provided, nor yet in so placing the new schools as exactly to meet the deficiency. Such an arrangement would have been in exact keeping with the great principles of the Bill. For, so far as the action of the State is concerned, it would have provided that all the children hitherto neglected should receive good teaching in secular knowledge and in the religion of their parents. We do not, however, blame Mr. Gladstone for not proposing this, although no doubt the fairest plan. For the opposition it would have excited would have been so strong, that he could hardly hope to carry it. The mass of the Dissenters would have opposed to the death any measure which, as the *Spectator* expresses it, would have caused the children to be educated ever so well, if it had been "under the flag of the Established Church"; and Protestants in general would have opposed, even more violently, a measure the chief effect of which would have been to secure a good Catholic education to thousands of Catholic children. Sectarian bitterness would, as usual, have been too strong for the interests of the nation.

With regard to compulsion, upon which there has been so much

discussion, we think the Government proposal about the best that could have been made. The League has in nothing showed more clearly its ignorance of the English character than when it demanded immediate, direct, and universal compulsion. Nothing more effectual could have been devised to set the whole labouring class against education. "Permissive compulsion, as it is called, is proposed; that is, enabling the School Boards (with the consent of the Government, and subject to the *veto* of Parliament), to draw up rules such as they think it may be possible to enforce in the particular district. This is evidently only an experiment. We are inclined to think that thus cautiously introduced, it will be a great benefit. We should be glad to see an attempt made to apply the principle to country districts. Why should not an analogous power be vested in the magistrates where there is no School Board? No one who has had any practical experience can fail to know that to secure the regular attendance of the children who ought to be at school is often more difficult than to provide a good and efficient school.*

The election of the School Boards is, as Mr. Gladstone himself said in the House of Commons, the point upon which most difficulty has been felt. We adhere to an opinion expressed in our last number, and to which the *Times* has since acceded, that the only way of getting a fair School Board would be to adopt measures which would secure a very effective representation of minorities. If the districts in which School Boards are to be elected were considerably extended, and the number of members to be elected rather large; and if the election were then left in the hands of all ratepayers, each ratepayer having only one vote however large the number to be elected might be, this, we think, would give us a better Board than we shall get in any other way, and certainly far better than we should get by any system of election which merely represents the majority. The object is, to get a Board which shall be fair to all parties. Such a Board should contain men of every shade of opinion and every condition in life. Sober-minded

* The editor of *Catholic Opinion* says, June 4,—"The *Times* goes on to jeer at the notion of compulsory education. To us it seems that no scheme of education will be perfect without it. It may be differently applied in different districts, but there is a large number of parents whose cupidity, and many more, whose indolence will never be overcome by any other means. Some say compulsory education necessarily supposes undenominational education. We cannot see this. Let it be made compulsory that all children should go to some school. . . . Let parents be compelled to send their children, and to send them regularly, to some school, and let them make their choice. If Catholic parents, being compelled to send their children to some schools, do not send them to Catholic schools, they must be beyond the reach of Catholic influence; they must have lost the faith, and with such we have no means of dealing."

men must, we think, agree that the great object in constituting a School Board is, to secure that it shall be as unlike as possible to our existing Boards of Guardians. Our best chance of getting a Board possessed of this invaluable qualification would seem to be by adopting the plan we have suggested. It would contain, as the *Times* says, "Ministers of religion of all denominations, churchwardens, deacons, landowners, farmers, manufacturers, tradesmen, artisans" [we would specially add ladies], "learning very much from each other, and effectually preventing the perversion of the schools under their control into mere seminaries of sects." In such a Board, no one interest would decidedly predominate, as it would be almost certain to do in one which merely represented the majority, whether of the ratepayers or of a town council. There would, therefore, be no great temptation to favour one sect to the injury of others; and when this is the case, the sense of justice, which is, after all, common among Englishmen when not carried away by party passion, would have fair play, and we may hope to see them do the best they can by all parties.

In reviewing the controversy of the last four months — the original proposals of Mr. Forster's Bill, and the changes introduced into it, first by himself, just before the Whitsuntide holydays, and since by Mr. Gladstone, we have hitherto considered it in the interests of all, both of the nation at large and of every section in it. But we cannot conclude without saying something on the peculiar position in which Catholics stand towards it. We heartily accept Mr. Gladstone's estimate of the essential principles of the Government measure. The great principle of all, namely, that education must be religious, we are sorry to say cannot be numbered among them, because the school boards were authorized, if they so pleased, to establish and maintain secular schools. But his essential principle was that the voluntary denominational schools were, as far as possible, to be used, and the principle of rating resorted to only so far as it was at last found indispensably necessary to the supply of a deficiency. His own words were:—

> We found this system not only existing in this country, but overspreading it to an immense extent and on every ground, whether of that which is due to the promoters of those schools, to their benevolent and self-denying labours, and to the success which they have obtained, or whether on the ground of the purpose we have in view, and to its speedy, uniform, and economical attainment, we adopted this principle as one of vital importance that we would particularly endeavour to employ the machinery of the voluntary schools as far as it was available in aid of our object. But feeling that that large deficiency which is now observable in the country could not be made up by means of voluntary schools alone, we proposed to fall back on the principle of rating, and to make use of it by way of supplementing the gap which we saw before us (June 16th).

It is to be observed that Mr. Gladstone's "vital principles" are here in direct opposition to those of the League. The vital principles of the League are free secular schools everywhere, with compulsory attendance, and supported by rates. Whatever indulgence was shown to the voluntary schools was to be merely an indulgence, an exception from the operation of their own principle, conceded because the Government was admitted to be, to a certain extent, committed to them, but the object in view was to be their gradual absorption; and even Mr. Winterbotham, although on one point (that of the freedom of the schools) he differed from the League, still admitted that he expected and hoped that the voluntary schools would gradually be absorbed by secular schools established and maintained by rates. Mr. Gladstone's "vital principle" is, that the wants of the country are to be permanently supplied, as far as possible, by voluntary denominational schools, and that rating should only be adopted so far as these shall ultimately be found insufficient.

We have a right to demand at least that these principles should be fully and fairly carried out in dealing with Catholics. And this we are sure Mr. Gladstone will gladly concede to us if he can. Indeed, as a general principle, Catholics have more chance of fair play from men high in the administrative system than from those lower in the political and social scale. For this reason we wish to see the Educational Department invested with the greatest powers of control over the managers of every system of national education, because we believe that Catholics have more chance of obtaining justice from any administration than from Parliament, and more from any Parliament than from the local authorities, town councils, school boards, boards of guardians, &c. In dealing with Mr. Gladstone we have a double advantage; for not merely is he, from his position, raised above the low level of bigotry of men like Alderman Carter, but, although strongly anti-Catholic in his personal convictions, he has a strong sense of justice, in all respects worthy of an English statesman. It is avowedly on this ground that he wishes the denominational schools to be in relation rather with the Government than with the local school boards. His avowed object is "to escape from the evils attending [religious] controversies in the local boards in connection with voluntary schools, and at the same time do justice to these voluntary schools, and prevent that action of religious prejudice against particular, and possibly in some places obnoxious communions, which may give great cause of complaint." And what the "obnoxious communion" is, he tells us even more plainly. "The voluntary schools raise controversy, especially in connection with one portion of the community, whose case is the most difficult to deal with, whose case is also one which demands justice at our hands, and which

cannot be overlooked—I mean the case of the Roman Catholics." Mr. Gladstone, therefore, recognizes not only that we have a right to equal justice, but also, what we all so keenly feel in practice, that from the local authorities we have, as things now stand, no chance of obtaining it.

Our real difficulty, we need hardly say, is, that in dealing with us, the objects and ends of most Protestants are quite different from those with which they deal with any other class of men. Upon this very subject of education, the great object we all have in view is to extend a more general civilization throughout all classes, and to raise its scale. In dealing with different Protestant sects, most men keep this before their eyes as the main object to be attained, and are anxious so to attain it as not needlessly to injure the interests of any religious body. With regard to us, experience shows us that the object is quite different. Archbishop Whately, for instance—a man, compared with most Protestants, liberal and large-hearted,—laboured for many years in a system of national education for Ireland, and at the end of his life avowed privately to his friend M. Senior, as all men now know, that the object he had had in view throughout had been "gradually to undermine" the religion of the people, and that he had been "obliged to fight the battle of the Education Board with one hand, and that his best, tied behind him, because he could not publicly defend it as an instrument of proselytism." The knowledge of facts like these make it simply impossible for Catholics to proceed as they gladly would, upon the assumption that men whom they admit to be (like Archbishop Whately) honourable in their dealings with other classes of men are not trying to "undermine" their religion, even when they most loudly profess to be aiming only at the good of the nation at large. We appeal, then, to the justice of Mr. Gladstone, as to a man who, severed from us by a great gulf of theological differences, demands our confidence because he has already proved himself capable of doing justice even to those from whom he is most widely divided. His Bill (sect. 84) admits the principle that special cases are to be met by special additional grants. Now that our case is most special he has himself distinctly stated. He says that the portion of the nation for which we have to provide religious teaching is five per cent. of the whole; adding, "I believe they assume that the proportion is higher. I take it at that. But that proportion by no means represents the share they ought to have in the operations of this Bill, because they are massed together in the great towns; and probably a tenth, an eighth, or even a sixth of the educational destitution sought to be relieved is that of the children of Roman Catholic parents." To this he might have added, that with this immense mass of the poorest of the poor to provide for, we are practically almost without any share of that middle class whose exceptional wealth is the

peculiar boast of England, and that of the upper ten thousand we have hardly a handful. The matter, therefore, stands thus. Mr. Gladstone's own vital principle is, that voluntary denominational schools should be the rule, rating the exception. But there is one religious body, and only one, utterly unable, however great and zealous may be its will, to provide schools for the secular teaching of a large class of its poor members. And that one body is the only body with whose principles schools such as those, the erection of which is contemplated by the present Act, especially as amended, are absolutely and vitally incompatible. We have, therefore, exceptional grounds for asking—we may say (as what we ask is a matter of justice not of favour) for demanding—special and exceptional assistance towards giving to the great masses of the poor of our own communion that secular education, which the State, for its own objects, has resolved that they ought to receive. No other religious body is placed in any circumstances resembling ours. The Church of England, for instance, may very easily, and by an exertion which its members will hardly feel, raise funds sufficient to provide schools to receive the children of all its professed members. If, therefore, its rulers believe that the rating schools, subject to the conditions now imposed upon them of not teaching the "Church Catechism," will be injurious to the religion of poor Church of England children educated in them, they have only to exert themselves, and, by the collection and expenditure of a fund like that collected by the late Bishop of London for providing additional churches in London, they may very easily provide for the education of all poor children of their communion. By the Wesleyans, the Independents, the Baptists, the same thing might be done without any extraordinary effort. Such a fund as was collected to celebrate Wesley's centenary would provide schools sufficient to receive all the Wesleyan children who need education. Moreover, it is now proposed that the schools to be provided by the rates should be regulated exactly on the principle of the "British Schools," which is that which these denominations have deliberately chosen for the education of their own children. To one body of Christians only in this country these remarks do not apply. The Roman Catholics have, on Mr. Gladstone's own showing, to provide religious teaching for "one-tenth, one-eighth, or one-sixth" of the class for whom education is now required (we believe for much more). The principle of the British schools is one utterly abhorrent to the whole principle of their religion; and moreover it is most certain that in no one single district of England will the proposed rating schools be made as little offensive to them as they can on principle be made, by having masters and managers of their own faith; while the Established Church, and still more the dissenters, may confidently reckon on

having them administered, in very many places, by men whose object it will be to train the children in the system professed respectively by them.

These considerations prove beyond all doubt that the Roman Catholic body in England has a most exceptional claim for government aid in providing secular teaching for the children for whom they are obliged to find religious education. But there are two others which make that claim far stronger. First, those who make it come into court not merely with clean hands, but with clear proofs that they have already done the State good service. The State itself regards the uneducated, untrained children of our gutter population as a most real and serious danger. It is to the exertions of the Roman Catholic body that it owes it that that danger is not much greater and more threatening than it is. Returns show that one-twentieth of the existing school provision in England has been made by their exertions; while all the schools provided by the dissenters of all classes in England, with all their zeal and with the possession of multitudes of wealthy men in the middle classes, is only two-twentieths. No one can fail to see, then, how much greater our exertions must have been to produce a result so nearly approaching to theirs. But this is not all. The conditions under which aid has been given from the Parliamentary grant towards the building of schools have all along been exceptionably unfavourable to us. As was shown in a letter which we published in our last number,* the rule that the grant must not exceed "the total amount voluntarily contributed by proprietors, residents, or employers of labour, in the parish where the school is situated, or within a radius of four miles from the school," was fair as applied to Anglicans and Dissenters, as giving an equitable test of the question whether the school was wanted. "But does it not sound like bitter mockery to the poor Priest, who has many hundred children to educate, with not a proprietor, not a resident *contributable*, not an employer of labour in the district prescribed, and who has to travel over England and Ireland to find contributors." This rule, measuring the assistance given by the State towards the provision of secular education for our poor children by the amount which can be raised on the spot towards it, has, of course, been a great hindrance to the provision of schools for the Catholic poor; but there have been other hindrances even more effectual. For nearly forty years aid has been given towards the erection of schools out of the Parliamentary grant. For very nearly half that time Catholics, and Catholics alone, were excluded, solely on account of their religion, from all share in the grant, towards the defraying of which,

* By Mr. T. W. Allies; see p. 435.

however, they had to pay their full share. Look, then, at the exertions of those by whom the existing schools in England have been provided, not in the fair and liberal light in which they were regarded by Mr. Gladstone in his late speech—as a great service rendered to the nation—but in a much lower point of view, as merely a race between the different religious bodies; and see the unfair terms under which Catholics, and Catholics alone, have had to run that race. All other religious communions have had some twenty years' start of us. It would, therefore, have been anything but wonderful if, in proportion to our numbers, our wealth, and the poor persons for whom we have had to provide education, we had now been found to have done far less than any other religious body in England. In fact, however, it will be found that in proportion to them, Catholics have already done, in this matter, very greatly more than any other religious body.

Under these circumstances we do not forget (we are not likely to forget it) the difficulty which an average Englishman has in bringing himself to deal with Catholics as he would deal with any other body of men under the same circumstances. Still less do we undervalue what must be felt by a statesman who, however strongly he may himself feel that we have established our claim to exceptional assistance, cannot forget that he has to defend and explain his conduct towards us, not before statesmen like himself, but in an assembly in which such men as Newdegate, Whalley, and their following, have seats and votes. But our confidence is up, that our appeal is made to a statesman who, in 1851, dared to stand, almost alone (against the madness which, for awhile, carried away both the great political parties) in opposition to Lord Russell's new penal law.

We ask Mr. Gladstone to judge whether we have not made out for Catholics a special and exceptional claim of justice, not for any assistance from the State towards teaching our religion to the children of that million of poor Irish who have been poured into the poorest quarters of our great towns, by the injustice and misgovernment which it is the special glory of his administration to have prevented for the future, but towards providing for them a secular education, of which they can avail themselves without violating their consciences, and without consenting to have the faith of their children "undermined."

What that special assistance should be, his statesmanlike genius will enable him to suggest much better than we; although the extremity of need and the sense of past injustice compel us to express in burning words the wrong which he has to redress. Is it too much to ask that, when he is cutting off for the future building grants for the provision of new schools, on his own declared ground ("The building of schools is the easiest of all the efforts made by their promoters. Their great difficulty is in the maintenance of schools;

and when we give liberal assistance to the maintenance, I think we may fairly leave to the locality the cost of the building"), he should make an exception in favour of Catholic schools, on the ground that in their case it is, not difficult but simply impossible, that the locality (however zealous in the cause of Catholic education the Catholics in it may be) could provide the necessary buildings? Would it be too much to ask that to Catholic schools in our great towns the building grant should be exceptionally continued, at least until it has been made available to Catholics for as many years as it has been made available to every other religious body in England?

And there is another ground upon which this special assistance is justly due to us. If voluntary schools are not provided in time, it is proposed that the School Boards should have the power of compelling the attendance of all children at the schools to be erected by rate. The teaching in these schools, whatever else it is, is to be distinctively Protestant. We do not forget that it is guarded by a conscience-clause. But this, although a real security to parents of the Established Church, the Wesleyans, &c., is to Catholic parents no security at all. It is but "a fraud, a delusion, and a snare." If it had been anything else the mixed system in Ireland would not have "undermined" (as Dr. Whately witnesses that it did) the faith of any Catholic child. Mr. Winterbotham's explanation of this fact is most true and sound. The chief Protestant bodies among us, although they have shades of difference in their organization and discipline, teach one and the same religion. A conscience-clause will protect the child of an Independent from being taught that three orders in the ministry were appointed by our Blessed Lord and His Apostles; and in all that is personal and practical to a child, the religious system of a school is the same, whether it is taught by a religious Episcopalian or by a religious Independent. But, as Mr. Winterbotham most truly says, no Catholic who deserves the name would believe that his child, even if withdrawn from the direct teaching of religious subjects, could breathe the atmosphere of a school Protestant in its master and in its pupils, without the risk of tarnishing, at least, its religious faith. We do not deny that some Catholic parents may be tempted, some compelled, to send their children to such schools. Such things have been done already, and may therefore be done again. But there is one fact for which we can answer, and which we beg all religious Protestants, and all sincere lovers of religious liberty, seriously to consider. There is, most assuredly, no one of these Catholic parents who does not, in his heart, believe that he is committing a sin, and doing a wrong and injury to his children, by sending them to such a school. Now is it, upon the lowest calculation, the interest of the State, that the moral character of

the parent (too often low enough already from the circumstances in which these poor people live) should be debased yet lower, even if there should be, to set against that degradation, some chance that the children may grow up, we will not say Protestants (there is no danger of that) but unsettled and indifferent to all religious belief. And this is the only effect which such schools are practically found to produce.

And if it should be by compulsion, not by milder inducements, that children are gathered into schools of a class which the parents in their hearts believe it to be a sin to allow them to attend, can anything more justly merit the name of religious persecution than this. How can this vast oppression be defended by men who complain of it as a grave injustice that any ratepayers should be called upon to contribute a few pence towards the secular teaching of a school, the religious teaching of which somewhat differs from their own opinions?

Think of it what men may, nothing on this earth is more certain than that it is a most real and serious violation of conscience, that any Catholic parent should be tempted, much more compelled, to send his children either to a secular school or to a Protestant school, even with a conscience clause. It is to prevent the enforcement of this violation of conscience that we demand such a degree of assistance as shall make it, we do not say easy, but conceivable, possible, that we may, by exertions beyond our means, provide Catholic schools for our poor Catholic children. If this is refused us, we may be forced to submit, because we are too weak to resist, but it will be with a burning sense of injustice and oppression, such as, in the language of Scripture, "drives wise men mad;" and it will be with a silent appeal to Him, before whose judgment seat we and these poor children and their oppressors must so soon meet to receive "the things done in the body, whether they be good or bad."

Of the conscience clause, as a security to Catholic children, compelled or tempted to attend Protestant schools, we have said enough. With regard to the enforcement of the "Time-table Conscience Clause" for Catholic schools as a condition of Government aid, we feel bound to say that we do not know and cannot undertake to foretell whether or not the managers of those schools will feel at liberty to avail themselves of it. Let it be remembered that the Protestant schoolmasters, of all denominations in London have unanimously protested against it, as limiting their power of religious teaching, and that it is admitted, even by Protestants, that it would interfere far more with our schools than with any others. This, however, it is not our part to decide. One thing at least is obvious. The mass of our schools are situated, not in remote situations, where no other school is within reach,

so that Protestant children residing immediately in the neighbourhood have no alternative, except to attend them or to go without schooling. They are in Liverpool, Manchester, and other great centres of population where Protestant schools are everywhere to be found. If the Time-table Clause is enforced as a condition of Government aid in Catholic schools thus situated, it will be evident that the object of its enforcement is not to secure the religion of Protestant children from being interfered with, but to interfere as far as possible with the religious teaching of the Catholic children. It is, therefore, a simple matter of justice, that if this clause is enforced at all, it should be only where it is necessary for the protection of Protestant children. Power should therefore, at the very least, be vested in the Educational Department to enforce this regulation in Catholic schools only where it seems to them to be necessary. It should not be in all cases a condition of Government aid.*

While we are on this subject, we feel bound to add, that in several Catholic schools known to us in which there are many Protestant children, the principle of the "conscience clause" has always been most fully, freely, and conscientiously carried out. We know none in which it has not been observed. We are acquainted with such schools, some in rural districts (where there are no Protestant schools in the immediate neighbourhood), and with some where there are Protestant schools, but where the Catholic schools are, for different reasons, preferred by some Protestant parents—and in every case known to us the parents have been asked whether they wished their children to receive the religious as well as the secular instruction—and no objection has been made to their attendance, even when the parents have requested that they should receive only the secular teaching of the school.

In conclusion, we will only add our strong conviction, that Catholics will be found ready cordially to co-operate in any plan of national education, upon the sole condition that it shall not be calculated directly or indirectly, openly or "unostentatiously," to interfere with or undermine the religion of the children; and that

* Our readers will remember that we have already quoted from the *Spectator* a passage exposing the injustice of compelling Catholics to accept this clause. The writer adds that 'it will be done 'needlessly,' because we believe that in practice Roman Catholic Schools will hardly ever have a Protestant scholar in them to be protected; so that this provision will, in fact, simply operate to cut them off from help in prosecuting a most praiseworthy public object—the education of the poor Roman Catholic children, without protecting any Protestant child's interests. Surely, if Roman Catholic schools in the Roman Catholic quarters of our great towns are well and ably taught to the satisfaction of the inspectors, and other Protestant schools are within reach for Protestant children, the former would deserve as much aid from the rates as the latter, in spite of their not separating the religious tone so completely."

if any plan should, unhappily, be sanctioned by Parliament which is calculated to do so, there is no kind or degree of opposition which a Christian can consistently offer to any law of man, which such an educational system will not have to encounter, not merely in Parliament, where we have, unhappily, no voice, but in every parish and town in which any attempt is made to carry it into execution. For, dear to us and sacred as are the laws of our country, the law of God and the souls of our children are far dearer and more sacred.

It is a clear duty to do what we can towards obtaining the incorporation into the Government Bill, of provisions, as fair as possible, to the Catholic poor. But it is most certain that, when we have done our utmost, those terms will be practically unfair towards them as compared with the members of every other religious community. Against this there is but one thing to set, but that one is everything. On our side is Almighty God, whose revealed will and whose wonders of love and grace form the peculiar teaching of Catholic schools. And it must be added, that, few as are the wealthy members of the Catholic Church, they have means which make it just possible, however difficult, that they should provide what is required in order, by the blessing of God, to turn the Government Bill from an extreme danger to a benefit. If they begin by doing what they can, we may confidently trust that what remains will be supplied by the boundless liberality of our Catholic poor.

What is wanted at the present moment is that all Catholics above the poorest should come forward with a liberality fully up to or even exceeding their means. A noble example has been given, when the first public declaration (which appeared in the *Times* of July 5), combined two things, a strong protest against the injustice of the present Bill towards Catholics, and a list of contributions towards meeting the evil headed by the names of the Duke of Norfolk and Lord Howard of Glossop for £10,000 and £5,000 respectively. All that is practically required is that all among us should do as much in proportion to their means. No doubt if Catholics are to be the first in expenses of dress and entertainments, and all that constitutes worldly display, they must, whether they will or not, sacrifice the pleasure of responding worthily to calls like this. But that this will be their deliberate choice we cannot for a moment suppose.

ART. VII.—LOTHAIR.

Lothair. By the Right Honourable B. DISRAELI. London : Longmans, Green, & Co.

IF George Eliot or Anthony Trollope had chosen to make the life of a young Englishman of high rank, vast wealth, and but lately come of age, the theme of a three-volume novel; and if, instead of the Marquis of Bute, who has merely become a Roman Catholic, the Marquis of Hastings or the Duke of Newcastle, who exercised their free will by embracing a different line of life not less conspicuous, were selected as its hero; if their relatives and friends, some of whom the novelist had happened to come in contact with through opportunities of office, or at houses where he had been received as a friend, were portrayed under transparent disguises in caricatures of unaffected malignity, it is not difficult to imagine what would be the verdict of men of letters and men of honour on such a book and on its author. It might be asked, in the first place, whether inventive power is not the principal talent of a writer of fiction; and whether the primary condition of its exercise is not the conception of perfectly original types of character, of ideal personages, never met with in the flesh, yet whom the author's imagination invests with a vivid, individual reality; and its second condition, the construction of circumstances and situations of a curious and unprecedented novelty, which, nevertheless, are in perfect harmony with the unities of art and the nature of things. If, then, it came to be known that some eminent novelist had fallen into the habit of finding his characters at the dinner tables, and his incidents in the family history of his acquaintance; that his books were only transparent travesties of events of the day, filled with venomous sketches of personages to whose intimacy he had, on different pretences, penetrated; that his plot attributed to them motives as coarse as those of Greek bandits and tricks as base as those of Epsom jockeys, what would the world not say of such an unique development of moral and intellectual depravity? But if this example came to be applauded and received as the rule of a new school of writers, then critics, skilled in the history of letters,—such a critic as Disraeli the Elder, for example,—would know that the time had come in which it only remained to study the successive stages of the decay of a once Fine Art. The standard of an eminent branch of modern literature would at once be lowered, and men would gradually come to

regard the profession of a novelist as one to be cut and black-balled. But what every writer of fiction, who aspires to a fair fame, would regard as a violation of the canons of his art, as well as of the ethics and etiquette of social life, it seems that a gentleman who lately occupied the situation of chief adviser of the Crown may do, not merely with impunity, but with almost general approval from the critics and the crowd. It is not, however, we may be permitted to suspect, every topic of high life, as open to free treatment as the conversion of Lord Bute, that even Mr. Disraeli, in all the exuberant insolence of this aftermath of his fancy, would have ventured to treat in a novel. We live in a time, unhappily, fertile in bizarre effects and sensational situations. But if (to take the last sad vicissitudes of aristocratic life in England on which the white light of the law and the beacon flame of the press have flared)—if Mr. Disraeli had made the history of Lothair blend the follies of Lord Courtenay with some of the more suspicious incidents of the Mordaunt case, and if he had wantonly and unwarrantably brought a Prince of the Blood instead of a Prince of the Church on the stage, would not all England have rung with a cry of shame? It is still safe, however, it seems, to violate every rule of art and every sanction of society, where the Catholic Church is in any way concerned. The end justifies the means when Titus Oates, in three volumes, exposes the last Popish Plot.

"But why," may some of the chorus of indolent reviewers exclaim—"why identify Lord Bute with Lothair, or name the name of the Cardinal? Why not ignore what every one knows? In a system like yours, one expects to find hypocrisy more elaborately and artistically organized." Mr. Goldwin Smith has been very hardly handled by the editor of the *Times*, for saying that the Oxford Professor's cap fitted his head to a nicety; and it was ironically hoped, on that occasion, that Mr. Phœbus or Mr. Pinto would be the next to avow himself. Now this is a point, we submit with all the respect that is due to so great an authority, upon which some consideration is due to the author's avowed wishes. What the critics, possibly already beginning to repent of their blunder of a sudden, wish to ignore, and what we presume to regard simply as a scandal against the laws of letters and society, is formally pleaded by Mr. Disraeli as his especial merit. In the official synopsis of the story issued by Messrs. Longmans,* it is premised that no small part of its

* Notes on Books, being an analysis of the works published during each quarter by Messrs. Longmans & Co., vol. iv. No. lxi.

interest is due "to the introduction of familiar forms, veiled beneath disguises thinner than the drapery of a Grecian statue." This sentence has, it seems to us, the even swing of Mr. Disraeli's own style. It might be read as a part of that paragraph in which the "divine Theodora" is described with her Olympian countenance, her Phidian face, and her Greek fillets. The very figure occurs in a passage where Theodora exhibits to Lothair a new American statue in the grounds at Belmont:—"Though veiled with drapery which might have become the Goddess of Modesty, admirable art permitted the contour of the perfect form to be traced." But there is at all events one place where even the drapery is dispensed with, and where the author, as it were inadvertently, drops the key of the book. Every reader of "Lothair" remembers the touch of art not meant to conceal but to reveal his artfulness, by which Mr. Disraeli once misprints Capel for Catesby*; and of course every one knows that Monsignor Capel received into the Church the year before last, a young nobleman, "whose vast inheritance is in many counties, and more than one kingdom." After all, there are not so many of them. Need his name be named?

Of course, as old novel readers remember, it is not the first offence of its kind which Mr. Disraeli has committed. There was a time when some one, obviously a critic, wished that his enemy would write a book; but Mr. Disraeli's impulse, on the contrary, has always been, as soon as he had made or flattered himself that he had made an enemy, to write a book, and to regard his book as a pillory on which to plant his enemy. From his earliest youth the many great qualities which he possesses have been marred by occasional outbursts of preposterous vanity and unruly vindictiveness. The morbid spleen and the vaulting egotism of his earlier writings were excused as the petulant protests of a young man of genius against a period in which he felt that he had not succeeded so rapidly as he deserved; who felt, perhaps, that he might never succeed to the point of his ambition, because of the bitter and obstinate prejudice of the country in which he was born against the race to which he belonged. He said in those days, "Every man has a right to be vain until he has succeeded." This sentence, whose moral would hardly commend itself to Epictetus, not to say Solomon, might be concluded in the same strain now-a-days, "No man who has succeeded has a right to be either vain or vindictive." Mr. Disraeli has succeeded

* Vol. iii. p. 254.

with a great success. He has held, for a time, that office whose power is greater than the power of any sovereign on the globe, save one. He, too, has made an archbishop, who is, in a sort of a way, the Head of a Church. He has made a duke; an Irish duke, certainly, in a peerage which now only exists upon paper, but who is, nevertheless, a duke, so far as the title goes, quite as much as any Sicilian or Dutch duke. He has given the Garter, and sighed, it was whispered, and glanced at his own knee as he did so. The title of Beaconsfield buckles the illustrious and venerable name of Edmund Burke to his name; a name lustrous certainly, but which, especially considering his last performance, hardly attracts homage. He has, if we may affect the grandiloquent strain of his younger days, controlled the conscience of the Monarch, and enlarged the liberties of the Multitude. But he has not yet learned that magnanimity is the true temper of a statesman. Whoso stands upon that lofty height, whence are swayed the civil destinies of one-sixth of the whole mass of mankind, of every race and creed and clime, should, if he have it not from nature, acquire, or at least affect, the majestic equanimity which is not less proper to a British Premier than to a Greek demigod. Some men, Mr. Disraeli's inferiors in those gifts which are ordinarily ascribed to genius, have sat in the great chair of the Imperial Council. It would be unfair to class him with Mr. Addington, who, after he had attained supreme office, treated Mr. Pitt somewhat as Lord Derby was treated last session, or to compare his talent to that of Lord Goderich, whose ministry was of as transitory a tenure. But who can imagine Sir Robert Peel, after he had fallen from office through the agency of what he regarded as an unnatural combination, actuated by the basest and most vindictive motives, indefatigably employing the period of his retreat to concoct a romance, in which an Irish demagogue, named MacDaniel, should be represented as suborning a Jewish gentleman of the press, named Ben Judah, with part of the Repeal Rent to subvert the Protestant Constitution, equally obnoxious to both the helot-born? The claims and the balance-weight of the Irish Catholics have wrecked more ministries since the Union than all other political questions and parties added together; and the line that was taken by some of their leaders and some of their bishops on the question of the Veto was very perplexing and even exasperating to several of the statesmen of the period of the Regency. But who can conceive Mr. Canning yielding to the temptation of writing a comedy in which Dr. Doyle should figure, in as thin a disguise as Mr. Disraeli has cast round the character of the

eminent personage whom he has chosen to name Doctor Churchill? Mr. Pitt, too, had his difficulties on this subject, in the royal closet, with his party, with those to whom he made promises which he not merely could not fulfil, but which he was obliged to break. His position was in many ways awkward, but his austere and impassable dignity sustained him through its severest stress. He did his duty, and died, and left his honour to history.

This book is, we maintain, an offence, even a gross offence, against the certainly undefined, but nevertheless well-understood rules, which bind the conduct of gentlemen, of statesmen, and of men of letters. But it is also, we perceive, regarded in certain quarters as a most subtle and formidable attack on the spirit and system of the Roman Catholic Church. In this regard it is about as worthy of serious notice as General O'Neill's recent equally profound and masterly attack upon the British Empire. The Church of Rome and the British Empire are, in truth, the better of such attacks now and then. They test strength; they clear the air; they, perhaps, prove men's mettle. And Roman Catholics, at all events, are simply not capable of feeling even the same degree of vexation at this sudden somewhat treacherous volley fired into their flank by a statesman who but lately wished to be regarded as their natural ally, that ordinary Englishmen feel at the more recent and not less grotesque and ignoble Fenian raid on the Canadian frontier. The judicious will take note that Mr. Disraeli is not a safe person with whom to transact public affairs, when Catholic Interests require, as unfortunately they too often do, to be brought before statesmen in office or in opposition. Some Catholics, however, far from regarding "Lothair" as a signal of rupture, and as a sort of curiously-prolonged and melodiously-modulated No Popery Cry, are so very charitable as to suppose that Mr. Disraeli meant by his picturesque delineation of some of the characters in this story to give, as through a glass darkly, and in outlines blurred here and there, an image not all unfaithful notwithstanding, of the power and beauty which attend the action of the Church. We have the honour to be Mr. Disraeli's very obedient humble servants; and without at all accepting Mr. O'Connell's savage, however grossly-provoked version of his genealogy, we may, perhaps, in regard to this far too highly-exalted view of the subject, presume to say that the Church of Christ does not stand in need of the right honourable gentleman's furtively (we had almost said, jesuitically) insinuated patronage.

Some future collector of Curiosities of Literature will doubtless trace with critical skill the causes and the ways whereby

that great design of an epic, through whose execution the name of Disraeli the Younger was to have passed to posterity in the same rank with those of Homer, Virgil, Dante, and Milton, so dwindled away in its author's mind and got so encrusted with the weed and the drift of commonplace life, that when it appeared as a novel, in all the yet frolicsome buoyancy of his irreverent senectitude, it only landed him in a place to be settled by posterity as somewhat lower than that of M. Eugène Sue, though undoubtedly higher than that of Mr. G. W. M. Reynolds. It was on the plains of Troy that the idea, which may be called the germ of "Lothair," first quickened in Mr. Disraeli's mind. The incubation has been prolonged, not merely for the Horatian nine, but for nine years four times told, of much meditation and many vicissitudes. He had arrived at the mature age of thirty when he saw his long locks mirrored in Scamander's stream; but he had only then begun to experience the delirious dreams of youth. The cold, coarse breath of London life had prematurely aged the heart of the Hebrew boy, and "Vivian Grey" was in truth the work of a *blasé* sage of eighteen. But, nearing the half-way stage of life, when he touched the soil of Asia, his vanished youth suddenly returned like the summer of Saint Martin, with a gorgeous glow, and a turbulent rush of fantastic fancies, and an obstreperous ambition, and all the dear delightful froth and fireworks of heyday. There where the wisdom of Ulysses and the eloquence of Thersites seemed to haunt the air, he underwent that "baphometic fire-baptism" which has produced a character that is still such a strange amalgam of Eastern fire and Western phlegm. There that mind received its settled form, which equally loves to dwell demure in the region of respectable platitude, or to soar in an empyrean of riotous ideality, curiously resembling a Yankee store far-west, where sometimes you come on petroleum and sometimes on shoddy. There, in fine, never contemplating that his name would one day be written in the list of the Grand Viziers of Great Britain, he pondered the even more audacious achievement of adding a second great epic to the English language; and awfully aspired to do for Napoleon what Milton had done for the Devil.

This is the preface of "the Revolutionary Epick," which is on the title-page described as "The Work of Disraeli the Younger, Author of 'The Psychological Romance.'"

It was on the plains of Troy that I first conceived the idea of this work Wandering over that illustrious scene, surrounded by the tombs of heroes and by the confluence of poetic streams, my musing thoughts clustered round

the memory of that immortal song, to which all creeds and countries alike respond, which has vanquished Chance, and defies Time. Deeming myself, perchance, too rashly, in that excited hour, a Poet, I cursed the destiny that had placed me in an age that boasted of being anti-poetical. And while my Fancy thus struggled with my Reason, it flashed across my mind, like the lightning which was then playing over Ida, that in those great poems which rise, the pyramids of poetic art, amid the falling and the fading splendour of less creations, the Poet hath ever embodied the spirit of his Time. Thus, the most heroic incident of an heroic age produced in the Iliad an Heroic Epick; thus, the consolidation of the most superb of Empires, produced in the Æneid a Political Epick; the revival of Learning, and the birth of vernacular Genius, presented us in the Divine Comedy with a National Epick; and the Reformation and its consequences called from the rapt lyre of Milton a Religious Epick.

And the spirit of my Time, shall it alone be uncelebrated?

Standing upon Asia, and gazing upon Europe, with the broad Hellespont alone between us, and the shadow of Night descending on the mountains, these mighty continents appeared to me as it were the Rival Principles of Government, that at present contend for the mastery of the world. "What!" I exclaimed, "is the Revolution of France a less important event than the siege of Troy? Is Napoleon a less interesting character than Achilles? For me remains the Revolutionary Epick."

Full of these thoughts, I descended to the shore, and again embarking, a favouring breeze filled our languid sails; and as the morning broke over the waters of the Propontic Sea, I beheld the glittering minarets and the cypress groves of the last city of the Cæsars.

In that delightful metropolis, more than once my thoughts recurred to my Dardanian reverie; but the distraction of far travel, and the composition of two works long meditated—one devoted to the delineation of the Poetic Character, the other to the celebration of a gorgeous incident in the annals of that sacred and romantic people from whom I derive my blood and name,*—finally expelled from my thoughts a conception which, in truth, I deemed too bold.

My return to the strife of civilization recalled old musings; and the work, first conceived amid the sunny isles of the Egean, I have lived to mature, and in great part compose, on the shores of a colder sea, but not less famous land. Yet I have ventured to submit to the public but a small portion of my creation, and even that, with unaffected distrust and sincere humility. Whatever may be their decision, I shall bow to it without a murmur; for I am not one who find consolation for the neglect of my contemporaries in the

---

* Both these works have been since published: the first is "The Psychological Romance," published under the bibliopolic baptism of "Contarini Fleming," which means nothing: the second is "The Wondrous Tale of Alroy." With respect to the title of the present poem, let me remind hypercritics that *Epick* is a good substantive, and as such is admitted into the classical dictionary of our language.

imaginary plaudits of a more sympathetic Posterity. The public will, then, decide whether this work is to be continued and completed; and if it pass in the negative, I shall, without a pang, hurl my lyre to Limbo.

The two first books of this revolutionary Epick comprise the pleadings of the rival Genii. The action of the fable commences with the third book. This work, if it be permitted to proceed, will, I hope, evolve a moral, which governors and the governed may alike peruse with profit, and which may teach wisdom both to monarchs and to multitudes.

The public did not, it seems, decide that the specimen of the "Revolutionary Epick" submitted to its view was, on the whole, worthy to be ranked with the "Iliad," the "Æneid," the "Divine Comedy," or even "Paradise Lost;" and Mr. Disraeli has, no doubt, kept his word, and done with his lyre as he promised. He has long ago resigned the hope of teaching wisdom, in this particular way at least, to monarchs and to multitudes; and is now content, taking his motto from Terence—

Nosse omnia hæc salus est adolescentulis,

to point out the path of salvation to the golden youth who dwell at the West-end and glitter in the Row. But he has never abandoned the design of painting in a work of imagination the play of the two principles that as he believes contend for the mastery of the world. The revival of the French Empire by a prince, who has tried to find an equilibrium for his throne by balancing the influence of the Revolution against the influence of the Church, evidently banished from his mind the idea of making the first Napoleon his hero. A great poet, almost worshipped by Mr. Disraeli in his youth, has declared that a hero is "an uncommon want;" and it must be admitted that there is some difficulty in finding one near our time suitable to an ambitious genius, who has felt constrained by conventional considerations to relinquish Napoleon Bonaparte. Mr. Disraeli, like Lord Byron, doubtless sometimes said, pondering the many names of famous heroes since Agamemnon,

I condemn none
But can't find any in the present age
Fit for my poem (that is, for my new one);

and so at last it happened that he decided instead on having a heroine, an actual heroine with a nominal hero. The circumstances of a time in which his ambition grew giddy, while his temper was tolerably, or, let it even be admitted,

intolerably tried—the time when he discovered that there was a great combination of Ritualists and Romanists against the English Church, and that the Church of Rome was an Established Church in every country on the globe—these, we say, gave a different form and a common-place colour to the crude and gaudy vision which was first revealed by the lightnings of Ida and fanned by the breezes of the Dardanelles. The conversion of one of the greatest of the Tory toparchs to the Catholic Church about the same time presented a promising thread for the narrative. And so a party landslip, a nine days' wonder of the town, an unsatisfactory intrigue, end in the right honourable gentleman's all at once dropping from the magnificent aspiration of being the ultimate rival of Homer, to the solid satisfaction of being the favourite client of Mr. Mudie. Long in the alembic of his imagination had the great design remained suspended in solution. At last a sudden touch crystallized it. The gorgeous epic that was to have won the suffrages of the world and the ages subsided into an ordinary tale of the town and the season. So can we conceive some ingenious and enthusiastic alchemist of the Middle Ages, who, projecting diamonds and sapphires, finds at last, after life-long labour, at the bottom of his crucible only a tawdry deposit of Bluestone and Glauber salts. The morsel of sham gem, however, the great character of the book, on whom its movement depends, whose influence rules all round her, who gives it whatever of epic impulse and consistency it has, its heroine, in fact, is undoubtedly the lady who is sometimes called Mary Anne and sometimes Theodora Campian. It is a remarkable character assuredly, a very remarkable character, but unluckily for Mr. Disraeli's reputation as a writer of fiction, it is not what can, with any reasonable degree of candour, be called an original character. As he, no doubt unconsciously, borrowed his speech on the Duke of Wellington's death from M. Thiers's panegyric of General Foy, so he has in some strange state of intellectual somnambulism eloped with his revolutionary heroine, and indeed with a good many of her properties and accidents, straightway from the fostering care of no less excellent a writer of fiction than Miss Amelia B. Edwards.

Mr. Disraeli's character is certainly peculiar, and in some respects may be characterised as rather abnormal than original. He avows that he has got two consciences—a historical conscience, as well as the ordinary one common to us all, but which must be weakened in him, we fear, by the somewhat polypous growth of the other. He possesses a very powerful memory, and

also a very powerful imagination; but there would seem to be no boundary between them. With him the memory overlaps the imagination, and the imagination extravasates into the memory. Mr. Disraeli is not capable, we should wish to believe, of deliberately stealing a speech from M. Thiers; he has made quite as many, if not more, and quite as good, if not better, speeches than M. Thiers. Is he capable of the still more silly and easily-detected misdemeanour of appropriating part of a plot and its principal characters from a popular novel hardly four years old? We should prefer to think otherwise. But the facts are very strange and very strong. Probably their true interpretation is that Mr. Disraeli is subject occasionally to a mental malady, which was not known when his father studied so profoundly the character, the amenities, and the calamities of authors, and which, for want of a better name, we may perhaps venture to call Literary Kleptomania.

Miss Edwards published, in the year 1866, a story called "Half a Million of Money."* Its hero, Saxon Trefalden, is a young man, the heir to an enormous fortune, who has been brought up in a very rude and simple fashion in a Swiss valley by his uncle and guardian, a man of austere religious principles; just as Lothair "was brought up in the Highlands with a rather savage uncle." At twenty young Trefalden is utterly ignorant of the ways of the world, and of the use and value of money. Of Lothair it is said, at the same age: "It is curious that his first dinner at Brentham was almost his first introduction into refined society. He had been a guest at the occasional banquets of his uncle; but these were festivals of the Picts and Scots; rude plenty and coarse splendour, with noise instead of conversation, and a tumult of obstructive dependents, who impeded by their want of skill the very convenience which they were purposed to facilitate." The Picts and Scots who welcomed Mr. Disraeli to Edinburgh evidently impressed him favourably. As Saxon Trefalden approaches the period when he will inherit his vast fortune, he falls simultaneously under two opposite influences—that of his kinsman William Trefalden, a keen and unscrupulous London lawyer, and that of Olimpia Colonna, a Roman lady of marvellous beauty, and a fanatical propagandist of the Revolution. Let us compare Miss Edwards's description of this lady, who is occasionally called by her worshippers "Santa Olimpia," with Mr. Disraeli's description of the "divine Theodora."

---

* "Half a Million of Money." A novel. By Amelia B. Edwards, author of "Barbara's History," etc. etc. London: Tinsley Brothers.

OLIMPIA.

He could not have described her to save his life. He had no idea whether her wondrous eyes were brown or black, or whether it was to them or to the perfect mouth beneath that her smile owned the magic of its sweetness. He had not the faintest suspicion that her hair was of the same hue and texture as the world-famed locks of Lucrezia Borgia; he only saw that it was turned back from her brow like a cloud of burnt gold, crisp and wavy, and gathered into a coronet that a queen might have envied. He knew not how scornfully her lip could curl and her delicate nostrils quiver; but he could not help seeing how there was something haughty in the very undulations of her tall and slender form, and something imperial in the character of her beauty . . . A really graceful, handsome, highly-bred woman was a phenomenon in Saxon's eyes; and he looked upon her with much the same kind of delightful awe that one experiences on first beholding the sea or the southern stars. Indeed, had Mademoiselle Colonna been only a fine portrait by Titian, or a marble divinity by Phidias, he could hardly have admired her with a more dispassionate and simple wonder (pp. 135–6).

THEODORA.

It was the face of a matron apparently of not many summers, for her shapely figure was still slender, though her mien was stately. But it was the countenance that had commanded the attention of Lothair: pale, but perfectly Attic in outline, with the short upper lip and round chin, and a profusion of dark chestnut hair, bound by a Grecian fillet, and on her brow a star . . (p. 69). Lothair thought he had never seen any one or anything so serene; the serenity however, not of humbleness, nor of merely conscious innocence; it was not devoid of a degree of majesty; what one pictures of Olympian repose, and the countenance was Olympian; a Phidian face with large grey eyes and dark lashes; wonderful hair abounding without art, and gathered together by Grecian fillets (p. 203) . . . As an astronomer surveys the starry heavens until his searching eyes reach the desired planet, so Lothair's scrutinising vision wandered till his eyes at length lighted on the wished-for orb. . . . He had read of such countenances in Grecian dreams, in Corinthian temples, in fanes of Ephesus, in the radiant shadow of divine groves (p. 216).

Here are precisely the same salient points to describe, the peculiar tint and abundance of auburn hair, the "Phidian" face, the slender, dignified form, the serenity as of stars, the majestic repose, the irresistible fascination of manner. Theodora and Olimpia are at least twins. About Theodora also there is an "Olympian repose," and she has got an "Olympian countenance." We should find it difficult to understand why the adjective Olympian is used twice over in a way so perplexing, were it not that Miss Edwards spells the word Olimpia with an "i" instead of with a "y," as Mr. Disraeli spells it. He has as good reasons for doing so, doubtless, as he gives for spelling "epick" with a "k." Why so much fuss about Phidias and Olympus? Are there so many busts by Phidias in existence that one can tell what is a Phidian face? If Mr. Disraeli does not refer to Olimpia, but Olympus, when he fabricates the adjective Olympian, he might just

as well speak of a Ben Lomond brow or a Magillicuddy chin. He flings about his scraps of Greek like one of Mr. Cook's tourists prodigal of half a dozen precious morsels of *table d'hôte* French. But this is not all. When Captain Bruges, in "Lothair," speaks to Mirandola of the influence of Theodora over the secret societies, he says: "The name of Mary Anne is a name of magic; though never mentioned, it is never forgotten, and the slightest allusion to it will open every heart. There are more secret societies in France at this moment than at any period since 1785, though you hear nothing of them; and they believe in Mary Anne and in nothing else." Mirandola himself is thus addressed and described by Captain Bruges: "My dear Mirandola, there is no living man who appreciates your genius and your worth more than myself; perhaps I might say there is no living man who has had equal opportunities of estimating them. You formed the mind of our country; you kindled and kept alive the sacred flame when all was gloom, and all were without heart. Such prodigious devotion, so much resource and patience and pertinacity, such unbroken spirit were never before exhibited by man; and whatever may be said by your enemies, I know that at the greatest hour of action you proved equal to it." In Miss Edwards's story, the character to which Mr. Disraeli has given the name of Mirandola, is Giulio Colonna, the father of Olimpia, and this is the way in which father and daughter are described to Saxon Trefalden by his kinsman the London lawyer. "Giulio Colonna has been an enthusiast all his life. In his youth he married for love; and for the last twenty or thirty years he has devoted himself heart and soul to Italian politics. He has written more pamphlets and ripened more plots than any man in Europe. He is at the bottom of every Italian conspiracy. He is at the head of every secret society that has Italian unity for its object. He is, in short, a born agitator; and his daughter is as fanatical as himself. As you saw them just now, so they are always: he with his head full of plots, she exercising all her woman's wit and energy to enlist or utilize an ally. . . . . She is beautiful and brilliant and very fascinating; and she knows how to employ her power, too. Those eyes of Olimpia Colonna's have raised more volunteers for Italy than all her father's plots." In fact, the function of Giulio Colonna is the function of Mirandola, and the function of Theodora is the function of Olimpia. But, moreover, it is all wrought out in precisely the same way. As Theodora, on a visit to Muriel Towers, is suddenly summoned by Captain Bruges to start the revolutionary movement which ended at Mentana, and

fascinates Lothair until he involves himself in it, and flings down his purse and picks up a sword at her bidding,—so Olimpia, on a visit at Castle Towers, receives a message from Baldiserroti, announcing Garibaldi's expedition to Sicily, induces Saxon Trefalden to give her a blank cheque to buy muskets and munitions, and sends him to the seat of war, where he turns up just in time for the battle of Melazzo. Both Theodora and Olimpia join the campaign, and both wear men's clothes in camp. Here it may surely be said are coincidences curious enough. But a still more striking illustration of the inextricable intermixture of Mr. Disraeli's memory and imagination remains. As in one page of Lothair he misprints, we believe, by design, the name of Capel for Catesby, so in another, he, by an astounding blunder, proves how he got all the revolutionary half of his plot by appropriating the very name of Colonna.

"The Mary Anne Societies," says a despatch, which Theodora reads, "are not strong enough for the situation—too local; he listens to them, but he has given no pledge. We must go deeper. 'Tis an affair of MADRE NATURA. Thou must see Colonna."

"Colonna is at Rome," said the General, "and cannot be spared. He is Acting President of the National Committee, and has enough upon his hands."

"I must see him," said Theodora.

And she sees him and sends him to Paris, having first given him a broad hint that he ought to assassinate the Emperor. Miss Edwards's Colonna "is at the bottom of every Italian conspiracy. He is at the head of every secret society that has Italian unity for its object." Mr. Disraeli's Colonna is "Acting President of the National Committee," and "chief of the oldest, the most powerful, and the most occult of the secret societies of Italy." What the chances are that would admit of the same character, with the same name and the same attributes, appearing by mere fortuitous coincidence in two novels between the dates of whose publication there was an interval of four years, is one of those problems which would exhaust the resources of logarithms and baffle Babbage's calculating machine.

We abandon to some expert in the art of literary vivisection the comparison in detail of "Half a Million of Money" with "Lothair." The question as to which is the better novel, according to all accepted standards, bears but slight discussion. Originality of conception is one such standard. That need hardly be mentioned. Delineation of character is another. Miss Edwards has produced her characters by effort

of imagination, and they are all finely individualized and coherent. Mr. Disraeli, on the other hand, has sketched half his characters from life, after the manner of a pictorial caricaturist, and acquired the others by petty larceny, or say piracy, which seems to be, in literary transgressions, the more accepted phrase. Miss Edwards's plot is her own; Mr. Disraeli has, so to speak, laid a plot for his plot. It is the result of "treason, stratagem, and spoil," not of fancy, reverie, and study. Mr. Disraeli's style certainly has more point and finish, more precision and sparkle. There is great grace, of a somewhat Cuyp-like character, in some of his descriptions of quiet scenery. But his upholstery, on the other hand, and he has a passion for upholstery, is as gaudy as that of Mr. Robins, the auctioneer. We seem to pace in his pages up and down a sort of "earthly paradise of ormolu." There are "bits" here and there of boyish buoyancy, quips of humour and fancy, which it is quite wonderful to think of as flashing out of a brain so *rusé* and so *blasé*, but on which, in some respects, the difference between the "teens" and the "tys" seems to have hardly told. There is not much to choose, in our opinion, between the way in which Miss Edwards describes high life, obviously evolving it from her interior consciousness to a considerable degree, and the way in which Mr. Disraeli, who has had more opportunities than the oldest peer, does so. But, strictly considered, his very high folk, especially his dukes and duchesses, have an air of the stage about them, and are made to talk "rank" as people some degrees lower in the social scale are said to talk "shop." Miss Edwards has suggested to that retentive imagination and that brilliant memory more, we suspect, even than the characters of Theodora and Colonna. The figure and manner of Lady Castletowers will, perhaps, requite a study more ingenious than ours. The way in which a young millionnaire leans on his attorney, as he makes his first blunders, must, we presume, be incapable of much diversity, for what Mr. Putney Giles is to Lothair that Mr. William Trefalden is to Saxon, until he takes to plundering him. Even the diversion of race, which gives a sort of subtle relief to "Lothair," has been anticipated by Miss Edwards. Here is a sentence every one will recognize as quite in the style of Mr. Disraeli's Aryan and Semitic passages:—"Only the historian and the archæologist care to remember how there lie embedded in that tongue the lost fragments of a forgotten language; and how, in the veins of the simple mountaineers who speak it, there yet linger some drops of the blood of a lost, a mighty, and a mysterious people." We can hardly persuade ourselves that this

sentence was not uttered by Mr. Phœbus, but unquestionably it was in "Half a Million of Money" we found it. It is strange that among the many novelists who write about the byways of London life, Mr. Disraeli and Miss Edwards should have such a peculiarly acute sense of the sound of the muffin-bell on a foggy evening. It would not count if there were not so very many other curious coincidences; but we willingly register the exquisite variation in "Lothair." When Mr. Disraeli contrasts the note of the nightingale with the tinkle of the muffin-bell, we feel that this is just what Hafiz would have said if Hafiz had happened to have been born a Cockney.

But, notwithstanding his memory and his imagination, Mr. Disraeli is a man of genius, and the homage which that supreme intellectual culmination owes to truth is like the relation of beauty of physical form to grace of movement. Where the figure is symmetrical, its attitudes and action are unconsciously easy and harmonious. It needs some perverse effort, or the action of some evil passion, to make them awkward and ungainly. And so it is in some degree with the workings of the higher form of intellect. Genius naturally tends to reverence and reflect even the very truth of truths, which it cannot fathom and will not worship, but may not ignore. It would be as impossible for Mr. Disraeli to hold in his mind for an hour, without some degree of injury to its faculty or capacity, the same view of the Catholic Church which Mr. Newdegate no doubt sincerely holds, and so far without apparent damage to his certainly very commonplace mental qualities, as it would be for him (we compare little things with great), suddenly to assume the same view of the French Empire as commends itself most naturally to the rather limited comprehension of M. Gustave Flourens or M. Ulric de Fonvielle. Hence it happens that there is a certain law of his mind, which obliges him, in describing such characters as Cardinal Grandison and the St. Jeromes, and Clare Arundel, and Monsignor Catesby, or Monsignor Berwick, to make them live, and move, and speak, so that they shall be, in some degree, true to the ideal of dignity and humility, of gentleness and zeal, of purity, and charity, and courage, which, as he very well knows (his earlier books testify it) habitually informs the Catholic character in every high expression of it. But, on the other hand, this book has its purpose, and the purpose is so bad that it at once lands Mr. Disraeli into utterly false art. It is absurd to suppose that the men and women whom he describes as of so elevated and refined a cast of character would attempt to compass such an end as the conversion of a young countryman by getting a

Roman tailor's wife to personate an apparition of the Blessed Virgin; or by persuading him, against the evidence of his own senses, that he had fought with the Pontifical troops instead of the Garibaldians at Mentana; or that the mere act of holding a candle in his hand at a particular procession had changed him into a Roman Catholic. M. Eugène Sue would, we think, have managed all this much more consistently, and quite as wickedly at the same time. The audience of Parisian *flaneurs* and artizans whom M. Sue addressed were as ready to believe anything he wished about the Jesuits in particular, as the less civilized of the English middle classes are to believe anything whatsoever about Popery in general. But the reader of Paris *feuilletons* is a much more critical reader than the subscriber to Mr. Mudie; and if Père d'Aigrigny, and Rodin, and Madame de Saint Dizier had been coloured so favourably as Mr. Disraeli colours his Catholic characters at times, and yet had plotted so stupidly at the end as Mr. Disraeli makes his people plot, the keen *flaneur* would have decided offhand that M. Sue was either tending to become *dévot*, or was getting *ramollissement du cerveau*.

But, after all, are we quite justified in treating "Lothair" absolutely as a mere novel, like the "Wandering Jew," or "Half a Million of Money," with a moral which is antipathic to our way of thinking? Perhaps it has been too hastily supposed that Mr. Disraeli only wishes to rescue the young aristocracy from the antagonistic spells of Rome and the Revolution. Certainly, if the golden youth of England were such as it is depicted in "Lothair;" if it were composed only of Saint Aldegondes, and Hugo Bohuns, and Bertrams, and Carisbrookes, and Montairys, or at best of Brecons and Lothairs, there would not seem to be so much will and manhood to spare among them that either side should gain very considerably by their adhesion. As a sketch of the minds and manners of the young heirs of "our old nobility," some future historian, (not necessarily a New Zealander,) perhaps a professor in the University of Andaman, or the Gibbon of Patagonia, may contrast certain passages from "Lothair" with select excerpts from the "Satires" of Juvenal, not without an edifying effect on the morals of the twenty-fourth or twenty-fifth century; and he will naturally argue that, whereas Juvenal's evidence is to be regarded with grave suspicion, in consequence of his well-known animosity to the whole Court of the excellent and beneficent (through the researches of a late learned scholar, happily rehabilitated) Emperor Nero, no such doubt can at all attach to the testimony of Sir Benjamin, who is proved by the curious and invaluable

contemporary "Brown Memoirs," to have possessed the entire confidence of his sovereign, and to have been the chosen leader and even educator of the English aristocracy at the time that he thus drew them to the life. The book itself, he may continue to argue, was obviously intended as an educational work, perhaps one of a series. Nôsse *omnia hæc* salus est adolescentulis. What are "all these things" which it is good for the young to know? Not merely to resist the influence of that ephemeral movement, called "the Revolution," in the absurdly hallucinated century which preceded the great Council of the Vatican. So profound a thinker would as soon have thought of advising the English nobility not to take to baby-farming or to enter the ranks of "the Peculiar People." The true view to take of "Lothair" it will be argued, is, rather to regard it as a choice collection of apothegms and aphorisms, conveyed in the ancient Oriental vehicle of dramatic dialogue. So the young British aristocrat (if of very high rank, generally spoken of in those days as Swell) is told at one time by the lips of Mr. Phœbus: "To render his body strong and supple is the first duty of man. He should develope and completely master the whole muscular system. What I admire in the order to which you belong is that they live in the air, that they excel in athletic sports, that they can only speak one language, and that they never read. This is not a complete education, but it is the highest education since the Greek." And again, he is instructed by Hugo Bohun: "The high mode for a real swell is to have a theatre . . You ought to have a theatre; and if there is not one to have, you should build one." What a real swell should eat in the month of November, we are told by St. Aldegonde: "What I want in November is a slice of cod and a beef-steak, and, by Jove, I never could get them in the North; I was obliged to come to town. It is no joke to have to travel three hundred miles for a slice of cod and a beef-steak." Lord Montairy, we think it is, who says: "To throw over a host is the most heinous of social crimes. It ought never to be pardoned." Mr. Pinto's impartial criticism on the dialect prevalent in high society towards the end of the third quarter of the nineteenth century deserves to be commemorated:—"English is an expressive language, but not difficult to master. Its range is limited. It consists, as far as I can observe, of four words: 'nice,' 'jolly,' 'charming,' and 'bore,' and some grammarians add 'fond.'" Lothair himself lets us into a strange secret of high life. He says once, in a very serious mood, "When all the daughters are married, nobody eats luncheon." These homely touches are about the most valuable material of history. When our

Andamanian or Patagonian professor analyses the character of an aristocracy who never read, who keep theatres, who travel hundreds of miles through fog to eat cod and beef-steak, who use only five words of their own language, and who abandon their principal meal for such an utterly trivial reason, no doubt his commentary will be ample and energetic. The chief cause of the Decline and Fall of the British Empire will at once have been made manifest.

What throwing over a host really means, and why it should be regarded with such unrelenting animosity, are questions which belong to the exact class of topics on which true scholars have in all ages loved to write libraries. The method of dealing with disappointed affections practised among persons of quality in our day, will, no doubt, seem very empirical seven or eight hundred years hence; but it may, perhaps, tend to revive the study of mineral waters. We refer, of course, to the melodious and memorable passage in which it is said that "the blighted hopes have gone to Cowes, and the broken hearts to Baden"—a line which so naturally flows into the air of "the Boyne Water" that we should not be surprised if a setting of it to that tune by Mr. Disraeli's secretary were found among the already cited "Brown Papers" on the occasion of the sack of Balmoral by the allied troops of the Siberians and Ashantees.

Some of what appear to be Mr. Disraeli's own more immediate opinions, nevertheless, now and then transpire. "To be a renegade," he says once, "without the consolation of conscience" (the historic conscience, we assume), "this is agony mixed with self-contempt." Again, an opinion on the nature of originality in art which is attributed to Mr. Phœbus is evidently the conviction of a more distinguished person. "A fascinating subject," said old Cecrops to Mr. Phœbus, "but not a very original one." "The originality of a subject is in its treatment," was the reply. Sometimes, hardly even in its treatment, we may remind the discriminating reader. This is not improbably Mr. Disraeli's own candid opinion of Irish politics, though it is ascribed to Captain Bruges:—"I am not fond of Irish affairs; whatever may be said, and however plausible things may look, in an Irish business there is always a priest at the bottom of it. I hate priests. . . . An Irish business is a thing to be turned over several times." Here also, probably, is his own matured estimate of the grand cosmopolitan revolutionary agencies, though it is attributed to Mirandola: "'Garibaldi and Mary Anne,' said Captain Bruges. 'A Polchinello and a Bayadere,' exclaimed Mirandola."

A gentleman who has been, and who not impossibly may

again be Prime Minister of England, is, we take it, one of the natural trustees of the Queen's English. What does Mr. Disraeli mean then by charging his dukes and duchesses with using such words as "heart friend" and "brother friend?" The most egregious Americanism extant is at all events better rooted in the language than such wretched weeds of words as these. There is an Americanism, or, to be more exact, a Mormonism introduced in a very famous passage of the work, a passage which the critics with one voice proclaimed "idyllic," the scene in Lady Corisande's garden at the end of the last volume. It may be hypercritical, but the introduction of the word "seal," in that scene, seems to us to deprive it of its daintiness. It is only at Great Salt Lake City that the act of betrothal is described by the word "seal." To introduce it in the detail of an engagement between two persons of the very highest quality is an act of lese-noblesse. Much do we regret to see that Mr. Disraeli has fallen into the barbarous practice of translating the French "de," when used as a prefix of nobility, by the English word "of." He dedicates "Lothair" "with respect and affection" to "the Duke of Aumale"—a delicate compliment to a Catholic Prince. "Of" is not the equivalent of "de" in this particular use of the French particle. Its general use as such would lead to grotesque incongruities. For example, the Duc de Magenta is Marechal de MacMahon. Should the latter name be translated Marshal of MacMahon? It is possible to translate Duc de Broglie into Duke of Broglie, or Duc de Persigny into Duke of Persigny, as it is to translate Duc d'Aumale. But the French have a habit of dropping the distinctive title in speaking of people of rank, and may say, for example, "M. de Broglie" or "M. de Persigny" without impropriety. Are we to translate these too, and say Mr. of Broglie and Mr. of Persigny? And if not, why not? The "de" has precisely the same significance whether duc, comte, baron, or merely monsieur stands before it; and, if there be a rule in the matter, it ought to rule all through. To etymological experimentalists, eager to extend the authority of our prepositions, we would suggest that they should at all events commence with such English names and titles as contain the prefix. When we have become accustomed to speak of the Earl of Grey and Ripon, and the Earl of La Warr, of Lord of Mauley, Lord of Moleyns, Lord of Ros, and Lady of La Zouche, or, to be very correct, Lady of the Zouche—when our tongues have got used to say Sir John of Oyly, and Sir Henry of the Vœux, and Sir William of Bathe, and Mr. of the Cane, and, in fine, Lady Clara Vere of Vere, then it will be time enough to serve foreign names

after the same scurvy fashion. In regard to titles, it would be gratifying to all polite persons to know where Mr. Disraeli discovered that it is correct to address a Cardinal by the form "Sir." He assumed, we suppose, because it is the usage so to address an English Prince of the Blood, that the same rule holds regarding a Prince of the Church. But the rule is not merely not a rule of the Roman Court, it is the rule at no Court in Europe except that of St. James. Mr. Disraeli has the reputation of being a purist in punctilio. He may have hesitated to ask information from any of the earls who followed their countesses to Rome to such good advantage; but he might have consulted Shakespeare as to the way in which Henry the Eighth spoke to Wolsey. There is a slight but graceful feat of phrase in a passage describing one of those noble ladies. Lady St. Jerome, it is said, "was the daughter of a Protestant house; but during a residence at Rome, after her marriage, she had *reverted* to the ancient faith." We thank Mr. Disraeli for teaching us that word.

But the ancient faith has always had a spell for Mr. Disraeli; and its unity, its ubiquity, its perpetuity, its majestic patience, its manifold and unfathomable power, have, from early days, moved his imagination to wonder, and almost his heart to worship. In those old epic hours, when standing on the dusty plain which has swallowed the many-gated palace of Priam, he revolved the destinies of an age in which the instinct of ambition and the inspiration of power told him he was called to play a part that would belong to history if not to poetry—the vision of the sublime sovereignty which was founded on Calvary, whose annals connect the grand dead past of Asia with the living genius and energy of Europe, and whose sway still spreads day by day, like the glow of light, like the flow of tides, over lands and seas unknown to Socrates and Solomon,—in those rapt hours of his youth he thought of the Papacy, and he thought in numbers—

> Lo! as the universal Pontiff waves
> His hand divine, and with celestial love
> Serenely smiles, as from a gloomy tree,
> Cypress severe, or melancholy yew,
> Sally bright birds, or from a gloomier night
> Stars brighter issue; thus on staggering man,
> Came Truth and Order with their welcome ray,
> Prophetic of the warmer joys of dawn!
> All sympathizing Rome! a favoured child
> Was Man when gazing on thy heavenly smile,
> With gushing heart and eye of glistening dew,
> A common parentage he fondly hailed!

Thy robe paternal grasping in his fears,
And in his sorrow clinging to the breast
That ever pardoned: parent, judge, and friend!
Alike indulgent, with thy sacred rule,
Returning Spring, with all its suavity,
Mellowed the wintry heart of rugged man,
Arts bloomed, and Learning budded; softening Faith
Burst like a balmy May-day with its sweets,
And made all gentle as its odorous breeze,
While on contending sceptres meekly dropped
The Peace-compelling Crosier!

And even still the convocation of the Council—"the Parliament of men, the federation of the world," in a different sense from that of the poet, but in a higher, and truer, and in the only possible sense—affects and somewhat astonishes his imagination. The following passage is supposed to be the language of Cardinal Grandison, and we must admit the imitation of that stately and lucid style is in a high degree artistic:—

"An Œcumenical Council!" said Lothair.

"It is a weak phrase," resumed the Cardinal, "to say it will be the greatest event of this century. I believe it will be the greatest event since the Episcopate of S. Peter; greater, in its consequences to the human race, than the fall of the Roman Empire, the pseudo-Reformation, or the Revolution of France. It is not much more than three hundred years since the last Œcumenical Council, the Council of Trent, and the world still vibrates with its decisions. But the Council of Trent, compared with the impending Council of the Vatican, will be as the mediæval world of Europe compared with the vast and complete globe which man has since discovered and mastered. . . . . That alone will be a demonstration of power on the part of the Holy Father which no conqueror from Sesostris to Napoleon has ever equalled. It was only the bishops of Europe that assembled at Trent, and, inspired by the Holy Spirit, their decisions have governed man for more than three hundred years. But now the bishops of the whole world will assemble round the chair of S. Peter, and prove by their presence the catholic character of the Church. Asia will send its patriarchs and pontiffs, and America and Australia its prelates; and at home, my dear young friend, the Council of the Vatican will offer a striking contrast to the Council of Trent; Great Britain will be powerfully represented. The bishops of Ireland might have been counted on, but it is England also that will send her prelates now, and some of them will take no ordinary share in transactions that will give a new form and colour to human existence."

"Is it true, sir, that the object of the Council is to declare the infallibility of the Pope?"

"In matters of faith and morals," said the Cardinal quickly. "There is no other infallibility. That is a secret with God. All that we can know

the decision of the Council on this awful head is that its decision, inspired by the Holy Spirit, must infallibly be right. We must await that decision, and, when made known, we must embrace it, not only with obedience, but with the interior assent of mind and will. But there are other results of the Council on which we may speculate; and which, I believe, it will certainly accomplish:—first, it will show in a manner that cannot be mistaken that there is only one alternative for the human intellect: Rationalism or Faith; and, secondly, it will exhibit to the Christian powers the inevitable future they are now preparing for themselves."

It is true, and it is the bare truth. All roads lead to Rome, and on all the roads men march. There are nearly two hundred millions of the sons of Adam of every race, and tongue, and rank, and clime, who look to the throne of Peter with a reverence far beyond that which the tribes of Judah even owned to the sceptre of David. The very list of a Roman Congregation electrifies the fancy by the magnificent incongruity of the historical associations which it suggests, while it soothes the soul by the sense of world-wide unity of faith, and law, and baptism which it confirms. In that august catalogue Jerusalem and Chicago; Venice, Bombay, and Monte Video; Hebron, San Francisco, Pekin, and Westminster; Vienna, Turin, Berlin, Paris, and Madrid; Brisbane, Pernambuco, Dromore, Hongkong, Arad, and Goa; Glasgow, Ghent, Kazan, Pesth, Amsterdam, Chili, Constantinople, revolve as in some marvellous kaleidoscope of infinite variety and exquisite unity. Every skin, every tongue, every clime, every order of society is represented there by men who have the aspect of sages or of saints, by men who counsel sovereigns in seats of oldest power, by men who challenge martyrdom at the hands of savages on desert frontiers. While the rulers of the world are levying men and borrowing money for a war which may bathe Europe in blood, this unique and august assembly proceeds in the name and by the power of the Holy Ghost to declare a hitherto unwritten law, the tradition of well-nigh twenty centuries, and so to consolidate and homage the authority of the Vicar of Christ in the front of a world incredulous, divided against itself, among whose children truths diminish, which is full of wars and rumours of war. In a few days more the great word will have gone forth from all the gates of Rome—from the hallowed lips of the Pontiff, who lives not in vain to the years of Peter, who bears not in vain, true conqueror by the Cross as he is, the symbol *Crux de Cruce*. With it will spread, we may dare to hope, a great current of grace, and a great energy of faith among all the children of the Church; and in the heretical countries, Germany, America, Britain, even in the Protestant part of

Ireland, there will be a more zealous propagandism of God's whole truth; and in schismatic countries more eager efforts towards unity; and in heathen countries more missionaries and more martyrs. But meantime the voice of the world is for war, and the Imperial Eagles swoop towards the bastions of Ehrenbreitstein. How the duel of the two great military powers shall end, who but the God of battles can tell? The battalions are equally big and brave, the armament nicely balanced, the generals as valiant and as fortunate who serve the Hohenzollern as those who serve the Bonaparte. The German Empire may reappear; the French Empire may disappear. The Rhine may ripple upon the same and yet another soil at Coblentz, at Cologne, even at Rotterdam. A Prussian garrison at Paris may try again, and this time succeed, in blowing up the Pont de Jena. The Cossack may arrive at Constantinople; the Spanish flag reascend the keep of Gibraltar; Belgium vanish from the map, like Hanover; Italy burst, like a bomb-shell. But when the deluge of blood subsides, whoever and whatever be submerged, for certain, the Ark and the Dove of the Ark will reappear with the rainbow—reappear in augmented reverence and power, ancient of days, but young with the youth of the angels, the Servant of the Servants of Christ, but the King of the Kings of the earth.

Art. VIII.—THE LAND BILL AND THE LORDS.

A Bill to Amend the Law relating to the Occupation and Ownership of Land in Ireland. (Proposed and brought in by Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Chichester Fortescue, and Mr. John Bright.) Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 15 February, 1870.

Lords' Amendments to the Irish Land Bill. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 8 July, 1870.

THE Irish Land Bill, at the moment that we write these lines, may be compared to some stout ship freighted with the fate of many men, which, after a difficult channel passage, sees morning break over a rising tide with the port of its destination full in view. It has passed many a treacherous shoal and sunken rock. It has weathered not a few gales of rough and contrary winds. It has had its spells of delusive calm. Once it was in imminent danger of sinking. Even

when it first saw land the coast was lined with the lamps of the wreckers. The helmsman's hand is still on the tiller, for it is not quite certain how many feet of water there are on the bar. But the voyage is, in truth, at an end; and after a few Custom House formalities the goodly cargo will be landed.

> O navis, referent in mare te novi
> Fluctus. O quid agis? Fortiter occupa
> Portum.

When we last wrote on this subject, Mr. Gladstone, in a moment more like despair than any that we can remember in the course of his energetic and zealous career, had said that he feared it must remain for wiser and bolder men, in a more propitious time, to solve the great problem of the Irish Land. There was for some days a serious danger that the Bill would be withdrawn. And if it had been, it may be taken for certain that no English Government would venture to touch the topic for at least ten years to come. Because the danger to the Bill did not in reality proceed from the Opposition. Mr. Disraeli was evidently unfeignedly anxious to get it out of the way, notched and whittled, as far as possible, but not at the risk of utterly destroying its use. Dr. Ball, who took charge of the case of the Irish landlords with the same skilful zeal that he displayed in the case of the Irish Church Establishment last year, is a gentleman who, partly because he was a Liberal politician until very lately, partly because he has a good understanding and no small degree of tact, knows when a measure may be modified but must not be resisted, and how to set the drag of discretion at the right minute on the run-away gallop of the Irish Tories. But where would be the use of passing the Bill over whatever resistance or whatever concessions of the Opposition, if it were certain beforehand not to attain its true end; if, it were certain, that is to say, that it would not satisfy and pacify the Irish people? This for a time seemed to be an evident eventuality. All the signs were sinister. There was a great and sudden increase of agrarian crime. The language used at some public meetings, and in portions of the press, can only be compared to the whisky drugged with vitriol and bluestone, which is sold to the peasantry at country fairs, causing a perceptible increase of violence and insanity in the country. But even in graver regions the most deplorable fatuities were uttered, and put upon formal record. The Corporation of the City of Dublin actually passed a resolution, which they directed to the Prime Minister, to the effect that the position of the Irish tenant after the Bill had been passed would be rather worse than it was before. One of the Tenant Societies of Munster occupied

itself with the task of vilifying Mr. Moore during the last days of his upright life, because he had ventured earnestly and wisely to support the second reading of the Bill. The *Freeman's Journal*, the organ of Sir John Gray, the one recognized orthodox advocate of Catholic interests in the country, the widely-accepted vehicle of Irish Liberalism, the steady, consistent, and honoured supporter of Liberal Governments like Lord Palmerston's and Lord Russell's, of Governments which denounced tenant-right in every mood and tense, and declared they would sustain the Church Establishment while there was a plank of the Constitution left to stand on—this popular and pious oracle was praying Heaven to pity the country that was handed over to the mercy and wisdom of such Ministers as Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Fortescue.

But, happily, Heaven has shed not pity only but sense on a country not unloved of Heaven. There are fewer clouds in the Western sky than Sir Robert Peel saw there a generation ago; the wail of the ocean is not altogether so melancholy as it was, even when Mr. Disraeli last listened to it. The country grows calmer. Crime diminishes. Every tenant in Ireland is thinking, and thanking God in these days that the Land Question will be settled and well settled in a year in which the country has the prospect of a finer harvest than, perhaps, any other country in Europe. The first and the twelfth of July pass by in peace. The noisier and more rancorous elements of opinion seem to die away in vague sound, as ineffectual as the echoes in empty houses. A wiser, less time-serving, and more truth-loving, a manlier, simpler, and more candid public opinion is gradually forming in Ireland; and the study of the process is interesting. There are countries which, in certain conditions of the growth of the public character seem to cast up scum where others deposit lees. Ireland is one of those countries which sometimes flings its worst elements to the surface; but a shake sends them to the bottom, and the liquor is all the clearer and calmer for the process. The main elements of Irish society are sound, notwithstanding the amount of turbulence and flatulence at top. The nation is still, in the main, as a great thinker fancifully described it some fifteen years ago, "a pious peasantry patriarchally presided by a patriotic priesthood." But it has been one of the worst results of the bad state of its public life since the Famine that the country has been drained not merely of bone and sinew, but of soul and brain. Men of honour and of talent have found that the conditions of public life have become gradually intolerable to them. In other countries one generation advances on the line of another. But whatever

be the cause, it is not so in Ireland. It would be a cruel irony to compare the extant and the rising generation of Irish public men with their immediate predecessors, with the comrades of O'Connell, with the school of Young Ireland, with the founders of the Independent Party of 1852. "Woe is me, there are no heirs of their company," as the old Munster song says. It is, however, something to be able to say, towards the end of the session, that the Irish Land Bill has survived the sorties of Sir John Gray and the stampedes of Mr. Synan. Their achievements will, no doubt, be duly honoured by the compact array of the metropolitan press—and we shall be edified by Mr. Mac Birch and electrified by Mr. Mac Buncombe on the extent to which they have saved their country.

Sit laus plena, sit sonora,
Sit jucunda, sit decora.

The Land Bill will be law in a few days, and when it is the law of the land, what is it worth? That is, after all, the touchstone of the politics of the last year. "Its three pillars," as Mr. Gladstone called them, stand steady as the Galtees guarding the Golden Vale. Every Irish custom regarding land acquires the force of law. Every improvement made by the tenant, or those who held before him, becomes the property of the tenant. No tenant can be evicted without being compensated for his improvements in the first place; but, besides, for any consequential damage he may sustain by being turned out. To evict a tenant thus becomes a long, complicated, and expensive process. The Ulster Tenant Right, and every form of Tenant Right which has grown up outside of Ulster, comes at once within the pale of the law, and can be proved in Court by evidence in all its varieties, like a debt, or a trespass, or any other claim at law. More has really been done for the conservation of the Ulster Tenant Right than Mr. Sharman Crawford ever dreamed of proposing; and no one thought in his days of legalizing Tenant Right outside of Ulster. The two clauses which Mr. O'Connell drafted for the protection of the southern tenantry have been embraced in the Bill, and given the fullest force of which they are capable. The scheme which Mr. Gavan Duffy first suggested for the formation of a Peasant Proprietary stands part of the Bill — a fourth pillar, and perhaps the most solid and enduring of them all. We regret, and we cannot understand why, Mr. Mac Carthy Downing should have insisted, when those clauses were considered, on the tenants finding one-third of the purchase-money instead of one-fourth, as the Government originally proposed; but, as we expected, when we wrote in April, the terms in regard

to repayment to the State have been considerably enlarged, and ten years hence, we have hardly a doubt, there will be many hundreds of men in Ireland who, thanks to these clauses, will know what it is to feel the just pride that belongs to a man who is the lord of his own land.

The ready and general acceptance of the principles of the Bill by the House of Lords, as testified in the debate on the Second Reading, was calculated to beget a false confidence in the wisdom and justice of the Upper House. Everything seemed to have been arranged beforehand for smooth despatch between Lord Granville and the Duke of Richmond; and the whole debate contrasted strangely with the volleys of religious zeal and party passion which accompanied the similar stage of the Irish Church Bill last year. So satisfied were even adepts in the ways of Parliament, after the opening speeches on the second reading, that the Land Bill would pass the Peers with hardly a change, that when Lord Dufferin delivered a lucid and elaborate argument, addressed essentially to those Conservative instincts of property of which the Peerage is the natural depository, his very colleagues seemed to feel that it was rather a waste of time and words. But the noble Lord estimated the difficulties ahead more wisely and truly. The one part of the Bill which then seemed to be in the gravest danger was the clauses enabling the formation of a Peasant Proprietary. We followed their fortunes with a peculiar interest, for we believe that they contain, in germ as it were, the future of Ireland, and that they will speedily come to mean, in a very true and solid sense, Ireland for the Irish. This part of the Bill Lord Dufferin so strengthened, by a passage of pleading masterly in its skill and foresight, that when Lord Salisbury, who began his speech in the cantankerous vein which afterwards characterized his conduct in Committee, nevertheless, led on apparently by the natural logical faculty of his mind, endorsed and further developed the same line of argument, it was clear this part of the Bill would go into Committee more strongly fortified than any other. It has passed through, with only one immaterial amendment. We have had occasion to differ from some of Lord Dufferin's views as to the true relation of landlord and tenant in Ireland; but we are bound to say now, as this great argument approaches its close, that in our belief hardly any living man has done so much to prepare English opinion for a large and generous settlement. He has done so, mainly because he always spoke as one who saw the two sides of the case, and whose natural attitude was that of a moderator between conflicting classes. If in some of his

public letters he seemed to lean to the side of the landlords, let it also be remembered that from his first speech in the House of Lords to his last, he has appeared there as the advocate of the tenant; and that when, in 1865, Lord Palmerston allowed Mr. Maguire's committee to be appointed, in order that Sir Robert Peel should get an opportunity of "eviscerating tenant right," he gave evidence hardly less valuable than Judge Longfield. Not many Liberal Peers in those days would so dare to gainsay the Premier's well-known dictum on the subject. We are bound to say so much because we feel that among many recent scandalous aberrations of public opinion in Ireland, hardly any has been more disgraceful than the calumnies which have been vented against this true nobleman, whose brilliant talents, humane heart, and manly and generous character are an honour to his country.

Before the Peers proceeded to consider the Bill in Committee an event had happened which, though personal in its character, elicited in Ireland a unanimous manifestation of national good will. The Prime Minister had advised the Queen to summon the Irish Chancellor to the Upper House by the title of Baron O'Hagan of Tullahogue. The O'Hagan of Tullahogue was of old the hereditary justiciary of Ulster; and Mr. Gladstone certainly contrived to touch two of the most sensitive chords of the Irish heart, its national pride and its religious zeal, when he summoned the first Roman Catholic Chancellor since the Battle of the Boyne to the House of Lords by the very title borne by the head of the clan who kept the custody of the Brehon Law in the days of the Celtic Princes. Irish Protestants, no less than Irish Catholics, felt and testified their satisfaction at the act of the Minister which thus set the broad seal of the State to a career, on many critical occasions distinguished, and in all its ways upright. But when Lord O'Hagan took his seat, the temper of the House of Lords had suddenly changed from what it was at the second reading. After the unnatural calm had followed a cyclone, and Lord Salisbury was riding the whirlwind and directing the storm, so far as storms of that sort are susceptible of direction. Lord Salisbury must live a great many years before it will be forgotten by his Peers, how he led them to produce that ridiculous tempest; and after what an amount of mere vague bluster, it had to return tamely to the cave of Eolus. Nothing that has occurred in its proceedings of late years was so calculated to lower the dignity and authority of the House. But all is well that ends well. Much of what was hurriedly done in Committee was as hurriedly undone on the Report, and the Act that will receive the Queen's signa-

ture before the end of this month will be in all, except some unessential details, the Bill passed by the House of Commons, and will, we trust, be, in very truth and deed, a substantial message of peace to Ireland.

It will be a message of peace in more than one point of view. Every Irishman of good will, who has watched the way that this question has made within the last year, must feel how much of its progress is due to the extraordinary zeal, industry, and ability with which so many Englishmen and Scotchmen devoted themselves to the study of its conditions. The astonishing Irish agitation of last autumn did not, we fear, much forward the cause it was intended to serve. Happily, the arguments that inform the minds and sway the councils of statesmen, were being otherwise provided by men who brought to the task an eager good-will, remarkable powers of detailed investigation, and, in some cases, a rare and intimate experience in systems of tenure. It is a curious and a gratifying fact that, as in the great struggle on the Church Question, the weight of the debate was borne by Englishmen —by Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, Mr. Lowe, the great mass of the majority also being English, for the difference between the Irish Liberal and Tory votes hardly represented a dozen; so when the Land Question came to be studied—and it is a question that has advanced through sheer study—they were Scotchmen who took up the task most promptly and effectively. Mr. Campbell's book and his pamphlet penetrated the whole case with an informed light, that made every man who read what he said, at once master of the great issues of the subject. The writings of Mr. Caird, Mr. Maclagan, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Leslie, Mr. M'Combie, Colonel Muir, from many divers points of view, urging different conclusions, but all uniting in a strong sympathy for the case of the people involved, and all conducting their investigations with the diligent but cautious patience which belongs to their country, threw, we say, the weight of Scotch intellect and Scotch feeling on the side of Ireland in a way that we are proud and happy to have an opportunity of acknowledging. The English press, almost without exception, devoted itself to prepare the data, which should commend the comprehensive settlement which the Government had promised to the public opinion, not of the empire merely, but of the world—for the state of Ireland had long been a question of world-wide interest. The *Times*, in particular, had amends to make, and it made them nobly. The editor was fortunate in choosing for his Special Commissioner an Irishman in every conceivable way qualified, Mr. O'Connor Morris, the result of whose labours is a book which

will live long beyond its occasion, and be cited as an historical authority, not less valuable but more, than the similar, but not so detailed or scholarly studies, which Arthur Young made of the state of Ireland exactly a hundred years ago. The volume of studies on tenure which the Cobden Club caused to be prepared, is another example of a whole class of profound and accurate investigations, which fortified a case which had, as it were, to go, like a wedge, through a mass of old-established opinion. Among the contributions of Irish research, of which, at another time, we may notice the principal, the book of Mr. John George MacCarthy, of Cork, deserves high praise for its accurate and clearly expressed knowledge of certain aspects of the subject, and, we need hardly add, for the easy eloquence with which it enforces conclusions, with which we could not, however, always see our way to an agreement.

Lord Russell, in the peroration of his speech on the second reading of the Land Bill in the Lords, eloquently congratulated the Premier that he had lived to achieve the task in which so many great statesmen had so signally failed. It is seldom in human history that a government has had the opportunity of giving to a nation a statute such as that which now bears the names of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bright, and Mr. Fortescue, and which in a few days will bear the name of Queen Victoria. The intense and sustained toil which its passage through Parliament involved, has not been lightened by the manly and persuasive eloquence and the large-hearted humanity of Mr. Bright. But it had the constant and eager service of every quality that is combined in Mr. Gladstone's character and genius; and the minister in whose especial charge it was, Mr. Fortescue, brought to its conduct a constant zeal, a thorough knowledge, and the blended tact and energy which is the mental habit of a true statesman. When this Act has passed, it will at once bring the magic sense of property and the sanction of just and paternal law home to the hearths of six hundred thousand men, the bone and sinew, the true constituent force of the Irish nation. That nation has its faults, like all the children of Adam, but it is a nation of magnanimous generosity and candour, as well as of patient charity and hopeful faith. It has hoped and waited long, and in the hour when God has at last heard its prayer, it will not be ungrateful to the men whom He designed to repair the wrongs of centuries, to free its ancient church, and to give its sons the sure possession of the soil of their own country. Blessed are the peacemakers—thrice blessed they whom the voice of a long-suffering nation salutes by that august and consecrated name.

ART. IX.—THE COUNCIL

Constitutio Dogmatica de Fide Catholica.

WE purpose in the following article to treat briefly three different questions; which have no other relation with each other, except as being more or less connected with the Vatican Council. We will begin with considering its first Dogmatic Constitution; secondly, we will confront the allegation, so assiduously put forth by disloyal Catholics, that the moral unanimity of the Bishops present is required for the infallible dogmatic definition of an Œcumenical Council; and thirdly, we will say a few words on a proposition laid down by one or two eminent writers, as regards a certain alleged note of an ex cathedrâ Pontifical Act.

I.

The first Dogmatic Constitution of the Vatican Council has so much importance, and in so many different ways, that it would well repay a most full and careful treatment: whereas circumstances compel us to attempt nothing more than the merest skeleton outline, of what we so much wish we could urge connectedly and at length. We will only therefore throw out a few hints of what we would say: and we must beg our readers to take the trouble, which would legitimately devolve on ourselves, of working those hints into a connected whole.

We will begin with referring to the form and circumstances of the Constitution, and afterwards comment on its substance.

1. It is remarkable how uniformly it implies the dogma of Pontifical Infallibility. According to the precedent set by all Councils over which the Supreme Pontiff has presided in person,—in its form it issues from the Pontiff alone: the Council purporting to have no other office, than that of concurring with his Definition. "*From this Chair of Peter*, in the sight of all, *we* resolve to profess and declare the salutary doctrine of Christ"; "while the Bishops of the whole world, who have been collected in the Holy Ghost *by our authority* into Œcumenical Council, sit and pronounce judgment in company with ourselves." Then observe the preceding sentence,—"We have never ceased to reprobate [these] perverse doctrines *in accordance with our supreme Apostolic Office.*" And finally Pius IX. "proscribes and condemns" the "errors

opposed" to *the Council's* teaching, "by the power given to HIM by God."* It will be evident to any one who reads carefully the whole paragraph, that the present Constitution is spoken of by Pius IX. as in no respect more *final and peremptory* than his former judgments; but as only differing from them, in regard to its greater *emphasis and solemnity of promulgation.*

Particular attention should also be paid to the sentence, which concludes the whole Constitution. It is essential, the Council declares, that "all those errors be diligently shunned, which approach more or less to heresy"; and the assembled Bishops "admonish" all Catholics therefore of their obligation, "to observe the Constitutions and Decrees, whereby such evil opinions have been proscribed by the Holy See." The Council therefore proclaims an obligation, as incumbent on all Catholics, of yielding intellectual submission to those Constitutions of the Holy See, which condemn errors that are short of heresy. In other words, as we should be prepared to argue, the Council has virtually declared that the Holy See is infallible in such Constitutions.

2. The second inference which we would draw from the Constitution "Dei Filius," refers to the *great multitude* of Pius IX.'s ex cathedrâ judgments. Some Catholics really seem to speak, as though he had never defined ex cathedrâ any verity except the Immaculate Conception. On the contrary, he expressly declares that he has "*never ceased*" (nunquam intermisimus) from condemning ex cathedrâ "perverse doctrines"; and he had made, as our readers will remember, an entirely similar declaration in the "Quantâ curâ." If for more than twenty-three years he has never ceased from such condemnations, the number of his ex cathedrâ Acts must by this time be very considerable.

3. The third inference which we may fairly derive from this first Constitution of the Vatican Council, is against the allegation of various persons, who have criticised this REVIEW in one important particular. We have maintained from time to time, that very serious doctrinal errors are often advocated by writers who have not actually ceased to be Catholics; and that it is a great duty to protest against such errors. Certain persons, for whom personally we entertain the highest respect, have been of opinion that such criticism is most undesirable; as tending to foster division among Catholics, and to generate other serious evils. But the Vatican Council declares, that "*many* (plures) from among the children of the Catholic Church have erred from the path of true piety"; that among them "the Catholic sense has been weakened"; that they have been "led away by various foreign doctrines"; and, finally, that they

* "Potestate *nobis* a Deo traditâ." Cf. "*Nos* inhærentes prædecessorum nostrorum vestigiis."

" have depraved the genuine sense of dogma, as held and taught by Holy Mother Church."*

4. We are next to consider the doctrinal teaching of the Definition. Before the Public Session of Low Sunday, various Protestants and disaffected Catholics had alleged, with that assumption of exclusive information which is so characteristic of the class, that its wording had been so extraordinarily modified and softened down, in deference to episcopal objections, as to leave hardly any definite scope whatever. Its publication has apparently put to shame these otherwise shameless critics; for they have not ventured, since that event, to repeat their calumny. Certainly nothing can be more straightforward and pertinent, than the lessons which the assembled bishops have conveyed in this their first utterance.

Its direct purpose is to set forth those dogmata of the Catholic Faith, which are denied or jeopardized by that philosophy of "naturalism or rationalism," which is the fundamental speculative evil of the time. In other words, the Constitution condemns certain tenets, bearing on the above-named head, which are directly contradictory to the Faith. As to those errors on the subject, which are pregnant indeed with *danger* to the Deposit without actually *contradicting* it, the Council is silent; referring Catholics (as we have just seen) to the various infallible condemnations of those errors, which have already been issued by the Holy See.

5. Firstly, then, comes the head, "On God the Creator of all things." The Council is obliged, by the atheism and pantheism of the day, to define expressly, that there is One Self-existent God, infinite in all perfections, ineffably exalted above all other conceivable beings, essentially and absolutely distinct from the world. The Council further defines, that this God most freely called creatures into existence out of nothingness—not as deriving from them any kind of increase to His beatitude and perfection, which would be impossible —but as desiring to manifest through them His essential attributes. Lastly, that He interposes unceasingly by His providence in the events of that world which He has created; and particularly, that even the free actions of rational beings are objects of His prevision.

6. The second Chapter is entitled "On Revelation." It begins with laying down, that God can be certainly known, altogether apart from revelation of any kind, by the natural light of human reason; and the corresponding canon solemnly anathematizes those who deny this verity. The extreme French traditionalism, which

* The "Civiltà Cattolica" does not hesitate to say, "that the Liberal Catholics, whether they are in good or in bad faith, prove themselves in these days more injurious to the cause of God than the sworn enemies of Christianity. This is a severe truth, but a truth it is." (June 4th, page 534.)

began with Lamennais but by no means ended with him, has now therefore received a final and a fatal blow.

The Bishops proceed however to declare that, even as regards God's Existence and the other doctrines of natural religion, Revelation does most important service "in the present condition of mankind"; viz., by securing that these truths "shall be able to be known by all men readily, with firm certitude, and without the admixture of any error."

It is not in this respect however—so the Council continues—that Revelation can be accounted *absolutely necessary*; but it *is* most strictly and absolutely necessary, in order that men may reach their *supernatural* end. God has most freely raised men to "a participation of divine blessings," the existence of which could never have been discovered by unaided reason, and which, nevertheless (by God's appointment), men must know in order to enjoy. Revelation therefore is absolutely and strictly necessary, for men's attainment of their supernatural end.

7. The Bishops next—following the Council of Trent—declare that the authentic utterances of Revelation are contained in the Word of God, written and unwritten, as handed down from Apostolic times. They are thus led to set forth some important doctrine concerning Holy Scripture.

Firstly. It is not sufficient to say that the Books of Scripture "contain Revelation without any error": it is further necessary to hold, that "they have God for their author, as having been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost"; and that they have been delivered to the Church herself, as possessing that quality. This statement contains a condemnation of the doctrine, ascribed by many to Lessius and Du Hamel, which the Constitution mentions in an earlier clause of the sentence. This doctrine is, that a book of purely human origin may become canonical Scripture, if the Church should subsequently declare it entirely free from error and otherwise worthy to be so accounted.

Secondly. The assembled Bishops clear up a misapprehension which has arisen, concerning the Tridentine decree on the interpretation of Scripture. We are not sure that we rightly understand the words of their Decree in this particular; and we have found some difference of opinion on the subject among learned Catholics. Circumstances prevent us from duly investigating the matter, and we therefore pass on.

8. The next chapter is on Faith, and contains a most luminous exposition of the Catholic doctrine on that virtue. In an act of Faith, the Catholic, assisted by supernatural grace, accepts revealed truth, not on the ground of its intrinsic credibility, but exclusively on the authority of God its Revealer. On the other hand, in addition to the aids of grace, God has given other assistances towards belief—external evidences of various kinds, miracles, pro-

phecies, and the like: "most certain signs of Divine Revelation, and accommodated to the understanding of all." Yet no supernatural act of Faith can be elicited, without "the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Ghost." Faith, even divorced from charity, is God's gift, and tends towards salvation; indeed, without some act of Faith, no single adult can possibly arrive at justification and eternal life. Catholics, moreover, have an inappreciable advantage in respect to Faith over all other Christians. For, firstly, the Church herself, from her singular combination of endowments, is "a mighty and perpetual motive of credibility, and an irrefragable witness to her own divine legation." "As a sign raised aloft in sight of the nations, she invites to herself those who have not yet believed; and she gives also ground of certainty to her children, that the Faith which they profess rests on a most firm foundation." Moreover, secondly, God gives, by a particular providence, a special illumination to the children of the Church, so that they can never lose the light of Faith, except by their own grievous sin. See especially Canon 6.—"If any one shall say that the faithful are in a like condition with those who have not yet come to that Faith which alone is true—so that Catholics can possibly have a just cause of suspending their assent to that Faith which they have already received under the Church's magisterium until they have gone through a scientific demonstration of the credibility and truth of their Faith—let him be anathema." At the same time we should add that, as it seems to us, the case is abundantly possible —perhaps not infrequent—of a person fancying himself a convert to Catholicity, who has in real truth never accepted the Church's authority with divine faith. Such a man's defection is no real apostasy, and does not therefore, perhaps, fall under the words of the Canon.

9. An incidental declaration in this chapter is worthy of especial attention. "All those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic Faith, which are contained in Scripture or Tradition; and which are proposed to belief by the Church as divinely revealed, *whether by her solemn judgment or by her ordinary and universal magisterium.*" Incredible as it must appear, some Catholics have been found to maintain, that no truths are to be believed de fide Catholicâ, except those which the Church may have *expressly defined.* But the Vatican Council infallibly decrees, that the Church's ordinary and universal magisterium is no less sufficient foundation for a dogma of the Catholic Faith, than is her solemn judgment.

10. The fourth and last chapter is on Faith and Reason. There are two classes of known truths—the natural and supernatural—differing from each other both in principle and in object: in principle, because the former is known by Reason and the latter by Faith; and in object, because the former is entirely within, and the

latter mostly external to, the sphere of unaided Reason. Reason indeed can exercise most important service within the domain of Revelation; nevertheless, even after Revelation has been given, Reason can never in this life demonstrate the *truth* of revealed verities. Yet Faith and Reason can of course never be at variance with each other. Whenever such variance appears on the surface, the cause must either be, that dogma is apprehended falsely, *i. e.* in some sense different from the Church's; or else, that private fancies have been mistaken for the dictates of Reason. Whenever therefore any proposition, which contradicts the Faith, is presented to Catholics as a conclusion of science,—they are strictly bound to reject it, as being, even in the order of secular science, erroneous or at least unfounded.

Reason and Faith, we have said, can never be at real variance with each other; but more than this is true, for they are of great mutual assistance. On the one hand, Reason has been the one effective instrument of all theological science; while, on the other hand, Faith preserves Reason from many errors and imparts to it multiform knowledge.

Lastly. The Deposit of Faith is no philosophical discovery, to be perfected by subsequent human speculation; but has been given the Church once for all, to be faithfully guarded and infallibly declared. Yet undoubtedly the Faith, once for all given by the Apostles, admits (as time proceeds) of being more profoundly apprehended, and more thoroughly mastered in its mutual relations. This is the doctrine of "Development": to which Father Newman drew such prominent attention even before he was a Catholic, and which the Vatican Council now has so distinctly sanctioned and enforced.

11. After thus setting forth Catholic truth—positively in the Chapters and negatively in the Canons—Pius IX. founds, on what has preceded, a practical exhortation. He addresses himself to "all Christ's faithful, but especially those who govern or perform the office of teaching." He "entreats them by the mercy of Jesus Christ,—nay, commands them by the authority of their God and Saviour,"—that they will use their utmost efforts to extirpate such errors. It is not unworthy of observation, that *all* Christ's faithful are exhorted by the Council to labour actively, as opportunity may serve, towards the overthrow of theological error: though this duty is of course more *especially* incumbent on those, who are invested with the office of teaching.

In conclusion comes that most important sentence, to which we have already referred. The present Constitution, as we have more than once pointed out, condemns no other errors, except those which actually *contradict* revealed dogmata: but "it is not enough," adds the Holy Father with full approbation of the Council, "it is

not enough to avoid *heretical pravity*, unless those errors also are diligently shunned which more or less nearly *approach* thereto." The words are spoken generally; but in this case they have of course special reference to errors connected with those particular doctrines which the Constitution has laid down. In regard to such non-heretical errors, the faithful are earnestly referred by Pope and Council to the various condemnatory Acts which have issued from the Holy See. To this class should be referred such tenets, as many of those denounced in the Munich Brief, and again in the censure of Günther. The modified Traditionalism, recently advocated at Louvain, will also come in the same category; and such ontologistic errors also, as were condemned in the Letters addressed from Rome to the four Louvain Professors. It must never be forgotten that these Professors were expressly required, not to obey these Letters as disciplinary enactments, but to subject their intellect to them "*fully, perfectly, and absolutely*," as to doctrinal instructions.

Such then is this first Dogmatic Constitution of the Vatican Council: commencing, as we earnestly trust, a long series of doctrinal definitions, which shall bring loyally-intentioned Catholics into far greater intellectual union than now unhappily exists; and which shall thus increase a hundred fold their power of combining in resistance against the moral and intellectual evils of the time.

II.

An apparent variety has at last been introduced into the discussion of Papal infallibility. Mgr. Maret, "from the bosom of the old Sorbonne," had given a new edition of the famous "Defensio." He brought to the support of an untenable cause, learning, controversial acumen, and a lucid style. Janus — from "liberal-Catholic" Munich—had poured out the vials of his wrath upon the devoted heads of the Romanizers. He brought to his work of destruction a crude mass of chips and cuttings, unbounded hardihood, and a not-misplaced reliance on ignorance and bigotry. Döllinger and Gratry had condensed into pamphlets the *virus* of Gallicanism and Liberalism for the behoof of those who have not patience to read octavos, or even to skim lightly over the pages of a duodecimo. In a host of pamphlets, articles, letters, in Italy, Germany, France, and at home, the old song had been repeated with variations. At length, it became plain that the orbis Catholicus would be moved from its resolve, neither by the time-honoured traditions of Paris, nor the insolent swagger of young Germany. Then the tactics were changed. The plan of direct attack on the doctrine, or the opportuneness of defining it, was abandoned, and it was sought to shelve the question by a side-wind. An ingenious

expedient was devised for this purpose. The theory was started, and pressed forward into sudden prominence, that a majority of the Council would not be competent to decide points of faith, but only a morally unanimous consent of the Fathers. The opposition outside the Council must be congratulated upon the cleverness of this move. In the first place, it is a diversion, and anything that may put off the catastrophe is a matter of triumph. Besides, it has the merit of seeming to bring new matter into the controversy. There is a scientific, abstract, general air about the proposition, making it look as if it had no immediate reference to a controversy of the hour.

The "Civiltà Cattolica" has devoted two articles to the subject. The first is a general discussion of the question, and critique of the various arguments alleged by the liberal journals in support of their view. The second is a rejoinder to a pamphlet published at Paris in reply to the first article.* We shall not enter into the particular controversy of the Roman periodical. It is well able to take care of itself, and to give a good account of its antagonists. But, in the few observations we intend to make, we shall take the liberty of drawing on its pages as occasion may serve.

We will begin by stating our conviction that from the point of view of reason, the controversy between the defenders and the impugners of Papal infallibility could not have taken a form better calculated than the present to put the true doctrine in its full force and light. From the discussion of the mutual relations of majorities and minorities in councils, the guiding and all-controlling power of the Supreme Pontiff will be made evident; while the doubts and fears which have arisen in many minds, as if the relations of the Pope to the Episcopate were about to be fundamentally changed by the proposed definition, will be calmed at least, if not entirely set at rest.† For ourselves, we have no doubt that a fair considera-

* L'Unanimité dans les Conciles Œcuméniques. Paris: E. Dentu. 1870.

† We have no desire to enter into a small verbal controversy which excited some notice two or three months ago. But we think that many excellent persons are needlessly scared by the use of the terms—*personal, independent, separate*, as applied to Pontifical Infallibility. The use of each of these words is right in one sense and wrong in another. The word *personal* is rightly used to set aside the distinction of *sedes* and *sedens*; a wrong use is to take it as signifying that the soul of an individual, on election to the Popedom, receives a new supernatural quality different from that of ordinary mortals. It rightly insinuates also that the prerogative of infallibility is incommunicable. The term *independent* rightly excludes the subordination of the Pope to the rest of the Episcopate, and expresses the true order in which the divine charisma of infallibility is derived to the Church; it is wrongly understood to mean that the Pope has no obligations to the *loci theologici*, as if, of his own good pleasure, without taking any means of ascertaining what had been revealed by Almighty

tion of this question of unanimity will result in these two conclusions.

First, that the novelty of this question, in the present controversy, is only apparent; since to ask for unanimity, as a condition of a legitimate definition of faith is no more nor less than to assert, under another form of words, that the infallibility of the Church resides in the consent of the Churches, in the sense of the fourth Proposition of the Gallican Declaration, and by consequence to deny infallibility to the Church of Rome.* The author of the *Defensio* draws out the whole theory in strictly logical accord with his first principles. Starting from the denial of Papal inerrancy, he places the sole and unfailing test of ecclesiastical infallibility in the consent of the Churches, whether assembled in Council or dispersed throughout the *orbis terrarum.* And, since all the Churches, taken singly, are liable to error, their testimony, to

---

God, he could propose new articles of faith or rules of moral conduct. So the word *separate* (which we should not think of using ourselves, nor are we sure that it has been used on the Ultramontane side of the controversy, though it has been ascribed to them by their adversaries): the word *separate* is capable of a right and a wrong sense. If it be understood to mean that the Holy Father, in defining this or that dogma, is not bound to consult formally the rest of the Episcopate, either antecedently, concomitantly, or subsequently, it is most true; but if by *separate* is meant that the Pope, considered as cut off from, or in opposition to the rest of the Episcopate, is an infallible guide of faith, such a sense is inadmissible, because the case is impossible. Should any of our readers think these and such like explanations superfluous or too late, we would ask them if it is not true that a good deal of heat in the present controversy arises from the fact that the parties to the dispute have not always rightly apprehended their opponents' meaning,—a thing by no means to be wondered at when one considers the fragmentary character of newspaper controversy.

We are glad to be able to confirm our observations in this note by the authority of the Archbishop of Cambrai. The thought and language are so like our own, that we must say that the passage had not come under our notice until after the note was written. In a recent letter to the clergy of his diocese, Mgr. Regnier writes:—"Dites que ce Pape isolé, absolu, séparé de l'Église sur laquelle il exercerait un empire despotique; ce Pape multipliant à son gré les dogmes nouveaux, décidant, définissant tout ce qu'il veut sur toutes choses, sans autre règle et sans autre mesure que son bon plaisir, est une création chimérique de l'esprit de parti. Le vrai Pape, celui dout nous acceptons avec amour et sans restriction l'enseignement irréformable et l'autorité suprême, ne peut jamais être séparé de l'Eglise universelle."—*Lettre de Mgr. l'Archevêque de Cambrai sur le Concile Œcuménique du Vatican. Bien Public,* 31 *Mai,* 1870. This letter has since been published in the form of a pamphlet by M. Palme.

* "In fidei quoque quæstionibus præcipuas Summi Pontificis esse partes, ejusque decreta ad omnes et singulas Ecclesias pertinere, nec tamen irreformabile esse judicium, nisi Ecclesiæ consensus accesserit."—*Denzinger, Enchir.,* n. 1191., ed. 4. It is immaterial whether we say the consent of the "Church" or the "Churches," since the author of the *Defensio* uses the expressions indiscriminately.—*Vide passim.*

have dogmatic effect, must be unanimous. *A fortiori*, therefore, those Bishops who happen to be present at a given Œcumenical Council, must be unanimous. And, always in complete harmony with himself, the doctor of Gallicanism refuses to allow infallibility to the unanimous definition of a General Council, until the decision has been accepted, expressly or tacitly, by the unrepresented Churches. But, as it would not have suited the tactics of the neo-Gallicans to have taken their stand upon the fourth Proposition, because in that case they well knew the verdict of public opinion would have condemned them without further hearing, they have treated the question of unanimity by itself and on its own merits, as if it were not a mere corollary of an erroneous theory of Church authority.

Secondly, it will appear that the prime source and seat of the infallibility of the Catholic Church is the Pope of Rome for the time being, and none other. For it will not only be seen that complete agreement among the Bishops is not a necessary condition of an infallible decision, but, which is much more important, it will be clear as the sun at noon-day, that the definitive power of an Œcumenical Council is derived in the last resort from its union with the Roman Pontiff and the conformity of its judgment with his. It will be seen that majorities and minorities *per se* are of small account. No majority, as such, has power to bind the consciences of men. Any minority, in communion with the Pope, is sufficient to command assent.

The first thing to be done, in order to place the truth of these assertions in a proper position to be seen, is to remove the ambiguity which surrounds the inquiry. At first sight it would seem as if few questions could be simpler in their terms than this. In Œcumenical Councils is a majority of votes sufficient to carry a question; or is unanimity, at least moral, necessary? And yet almost every term must be distinguished and limited before we can properly understand its bearing. As we are not writing a treatise on Councils, but only offering a small contribution to a question of the day, we have no intention of opening out and examining all the ramifications of the above question. We shall indicate so much as may be necessary to enable us to answer with special reference to the discussion on the subject of Infallibility.

Let us then analyze the question. Œcumenical Councils, speaking from our present point of view, are of two sorts. In some the Pontiff sits in person; in others he is represented by legates. When present he sits in a double capacity of President and of Prince.* He has this double character, because although the church is a monarchy, the Bishops in Council are not simply consultors and

* Bellar., De Conc. et Eccles., lib. i. cap. 18, n. 16.

advisers of his Holiness, but real judges of the faith. But as the Pope can never, and least of all in a definition of faith, divest himself of his character of Prince, it is unnecessary for us to discuss his relations to the Council in quality of President. When represented by legates he may take no further part than to confirm whatever true and just decrees may be voted by the Council, or he may from a distance direct the whole course of procedure so that no subject shall be introduced except from his initiative. Further, an Œcumenical Council may be considered before or after the Pope's judgment is known. In the one case the Bishops would be completely independent in voting; in the other their votes, on a question of doctrine, could be no more than a solemn approbation, confirmation, and promulgation of the Papal decision. Does the question refer to all these cases, or to some only, and which of them?

Again the term "moral unanimity" is vague. What fraction destroys it, and what may be overlooked? Are the votes to be counted or weighed? And if weighed, by what standard?

Once more, is the question asked of all subjects that may come before a General Council, or only of matters of faith, or in fine of the one point of Papal Infallibility only? Finally, is the theory confined to doctrinal decrees, or does it extend to disciplinary decrees also?

It will have been seen that a great deal more is contained in the above question than appears at first sight, and that a wide door is opened to interminable controversy. It is in order to avoid any such catastrophe that we have spent so many words in expanding the sense of the question. For the same reason we shall confine the inquiry to matters of faith, including, of course, the particular question of Papal Infallibility. For that point can be excluded only on the heretical ground which Döllinger has taken up, namely, that in such a case the Pope would be judge in his own cause. Moreover, we shall speak of the Pope as taking an actual part in the Council, either by word of mouth if present, or by writing if absent. Further, we shall exclude, without argument, all such distinctions and suppositions as depend upon an heretical principle. Thus, for instance, we shall consider the vote of the most obscure Vicar-Apostolic precisely equal to that of a Cardinal Archbishop of Paris or Vienna, in a definition of faith, for the simple reason that all and only Bishops, as such, are of the *Ecclesia Docens.* To imply a representative character in Bishops, in the sense that their voices are to be weighed by the population and civilization of their dioceses, is the same as saying that the laity are judges of faith, which is a Jansenist heresy.*

* We have more than once called attention in this Review to the fact that this heresy is still prevalent. The Munich school, with all its belong-

We are now in a position to answer in brief the question before us. In order to make the argument as clear and comprehensive as possible, we will suppose an extreme instance in illustration. Let us take the case of an Œcumenical Council, at which the bishops of the Universal Church, with few exceptions, are present; *e.g.* take the Vatican Council as an example, adding about one hundred and fifty to the actual number of Fathers. Let us suppose a division on a point of faith which imperatively demands solution. Let us further suppose that one side gains a bare majority of votes. The hypothesis is perfectly possible, at least in the abstract, because Almighty God has not promised indefectibility in the faith to one-half the Church rather than to the other. As the Bishop of Orleans wrote some time ago, though in a different connection, the church is indefectible, but France and Spain and Portugal have no guarantee that the faith will be preserved within their borders any more than in the East, and Germany, and England.* In such a case then neither party would be bound to yield. Not the majority, as will be readily admitted by Gallicans. Not the minority, because the promises were not made to a majority as such. But place the Pope on the side of the majority, and what happens? According to theologians and canonists of all schools, the Council may proceed to a definition; the minority is bound to go over to the side of the majority; and the decision is definitively and legally binding on all Catholics. Therefore, on principles recognized by Gallicans, as by the rest of the *Schola*, a case is perfectly conceivable in which the consent of the Churches is not necessary to the legitimate definition and promulgation of an article of faith. But in the case

---

ings, is impregnated with its poison. It lies at the root of Catholic Liberalism in all its branches. In our last number (p. 306) we gave reasons for regarding this tenet as strictly heretical, but we may also cite the condemned proposition of the Synod of Pistoja:—"Propositio quæ statuit, potestatem a Deo datam Ecclesiæ, ut communicaretur pastoribus, qui sunt ejus ministri pro salute animarum; sic intellecta, *ut a communitate fidelium in pastores derivetur ecclesiastici ministerii ac regiminis potestas: hæretica.*"—Prop. 2da inter Pistorien. damnatas a Pio VI. per Constit.: *Auctorem Fidei*, apud Denzinger. Enchir., n. 365, ed. 4. It will be objected perhaps that the teaching power of the Church is not included in the proposition as it stands, and that we are therefore unwarrantably extending the force of the qualification. But it does not seem to us, speaking under correction, that the objection can be sustained. In a dogmatic definition two things are to be distinguished. For such a definition is not only infallibly true, but must be believed by all as infallibly true. Now this obligation of belief does not arise, strictly speaking, from the infallibility of the decision, but from the Church's mission to teach the whole world, together with the corresponding obligation on the part of mankind of listening to her voice. That is, a definition of faith is an act of jurisdiction, and therefore comes under the term *regimen*.

* We are referring from memory to a passage of the eloquent Bishop's second letter to Mgr. Dechamps.

supposed, the consent of the Churches is the same thing as unanimity among the Fathers, since all the Churches are represented. And if no account is taken of a minority of Bishops actually present, and exercising their office of judges, much less would there be any waiting for the adhesion of unrepresented churches. *A fortiori* therefore, in councils in which a part only of the Episcopate sat, unanimity would not be required, because it would always be presumed that the unrepresented Churches were on the side of the Pope.

And now we are arrived at a point where we may see, as by a sort of revelation, the utter baselessness of the Gallican theory. The more moderate Gallicans, like Tournely, admit the Pope's right, in the case supposed, to vote with the majority or minority, as he pleases. Not only so, but they admit further that, in the case of his voting with the minority, the majority is bound to go over to his side, which is most true, though it is not for us to reconcile it with the Fourth Article of the Declaration. Natalis Alexander supposes the case of a Pope sending his decision on a controverted point of faith to a General Council, and teaches, *totidem verbis*, that the sounder part of the Council, and therefore the one which commands the obedience of the faithful, is that which adheres to the Pope's judgment, no regard being had to the relative numbers of the dissentients.* And Tournely speaks in the same sense, except that his words are general, and refer directly to the Bishops dispersed. But this circumstance does not weaken the force of his testimony, since, as we have already seen, genuine Gallicanism knows of no distinction between the rights, in matters of faith, of Bishops dispersed and assembled in Council. Tournely puts the crucial case which is fatal to his own teaching. He supposes a division among the Bishops, in such sort that several (*plures*) are on one side with the Roman Pontiff, and several (*plures*) on the other side without the Pope; and he has no doubt (*haud dubie*) that the side must be followed which is united with the head.

---

* Si enim Episcoporum major AUT sanior pars (sanior autem est, quæ Ecclesiæ Romanæ ceterarum Matri et Magistræ et Summo Pontifici, Christianorum omnium Patri et Doctori, fidei depositum tuenti adhæret) illius definitionem ac sententiam, ut ore S. Petri prolatam receperit, nemini Catholice sentienti debet esse dubium quin Romanus Pontifex in ea ferenda Fidei regulas secutus sit, cum errare non possit Ecclesia, quæ est columna et firmamentum veritatis.—*Nat. Alex.' Hist. Eccles. Sæc. VII.*, dissert. ii., prop. 2. Cfr. Tournely de Ecclesia, tom. ii., qu. v., art. 3, p. 163.

It is hardly necessary to call the reader's attention to the circular reasoning of the Gallican theologian. The faithful are assured that the Pope has made no mistake if the sounder part of the Episcopate agree with him. They must not, however, forget that the sounder part of the Episcopate is precisely that which adheres to him! In justice to Natalis Alexander, it ought to be said that the circle is not his own, but essentially involved in the system he was defending.

Now what is the value of these admissions, if we are to call them admissions, and not rather direct teaching, of Natalis and Tournely? Such language is nothing less than an equivalent assertion of the Ultramontane doctrine. If, in such a division, the Pope is bound to follow neither side, and if all are bound to follow the side which he elects, what is this but to say that, in the last resort, the infallibility of the Church has its root and fixed abode in him, and in him without subordination to his brethren in the Episcopate? But Mgr. Maret, who lives in an age of parliamentary government, maintains that the Pope is bound to adhere to a certain large majority; nay, that if necessary, he may be coerced into adhesion. In point of consistency this doctrine is no more in harmony with the fundamental principle of Gallicanism than the former opinion. But that is a small matter compared with the portentous conclusions it involves.

Let us turn once more to our supposed case. All the Fathers of the Council have voted freely, each according to his conscience. There is a large majority on one side. To this the Pope is called upon to adhere, *nolens volens*, with the choice of deposition if he refuses. We are not misrepresenting the Bishop of Sura. He teaches that a large conciliar majority forces to its side, of right, the Pope and the minority. And so it has come to this, that whereas the meanest bishop of Christendom has at least a free judicial voice, the chief bishop is to have none; whereas by the fourth Gallican article, the judgment of the Roman Pontiff in matters of faith, though not irreformable, was yet paramount, save in the sole case of an opposing consent of the Church, according to Mgr. Maret, the Pope is to exercise no judgment at all in that very case in which a judge is most wanted; whereas, the very Jansenists themselves allowed the Roman Bishop to be executor of the decrees of the Universal Church, this theory makes him the bond slave of a fraction.

Enough has been already said not only to show that the theory of unanimity as a necessary condition of conciliar dogmatic definitions, has no foundation in the constitution of the Church, but also to lay open the necessary inter-dependence of the Papal Primacy and Infallibility. Maintain the primacy of jurisdiction with Tournely, and you will be driven by an irresistible logic to conclusions which involve infallibility, and cannot be supported except on that basis; deny infallibility with Mgr. Maret, and the primacy becomes a mere primacy of order.

But we should not be doing justice to the strength of our own, nor to the weakness of the Gallican-Liberal case, if we omitted to notice the arguments alleged in support of that view. First comes the Vincentian canon—*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*—treated with as much reverence as a dogmatic definition of an Œcumenical Council, or as a passage of Holy Scripture, the mean-

ing of which had been undoubtedly ascertained.* The rule, as enunciated and explained by the monk of Lérins, is a concise expression of the principle that tradition, personal, temporal, and local, is the golden rule of Catholic faith. But the author's sense is unequal to the use now made of his *dictum*. What he had said in a positive sense and with reference to past time, and had explained at length in that sense, is now used negatively and of present controversy. The absurdity of the exclusive sense is apparent from the instance of the Immaculate Conception, which was certainly not taught *ab omnibus*. The chief theological school of Christendom, as a body was for ages opposed to the doctrine. To say, with S. Vincent, that what has been always and everywhere believed in the Catholic Church is to be held fast, is most true. To say that what has been denied in any place or at any time, or is now denied in any place, is to be rejected as forming no part of Catholic doctrine, is ridiculous. To interpret the Vincentian canon in such a sense, is sophistical. To say that the author of the Commonitorium was of that opinion, is unjust and untrue.

But, it is further alleged, the Vincentian canon, in a negative and exclusive sense, has been invariably acted upon in Œcumenical Councils. This argument, in so far as it is not to be met by a direct contradiction, is purely captious. It has a semblance of force at first sight, simply because Bishops who belonged to the unorthodox side, frequently absented themselves from Œcumenical Councils. No one can doubt that John of Antioch and his suffragans would have kept their places at Ephesus if they had had the slightest hope of averting, by their contrary vote, the condemnation of Nestorius. But, present or absent, the minority (or rather those Bishops, whatever their number, who were opposed to the doctrine of the Roman See) were not taken into account in the definitions of Councils. An imposing minority was not only not deferred to, but was formally declared heretical, in the first Council of Constantinople.† But even if there had never been one dissentient voice in a single Œcumenical Council, the opinion that unanimity is necessary for the validity of conciliar decisions de fide would be in no degree strengthened by the fact. Not only "a non esse ad non posse non valet argumentum," but the opinion is founded on a hypothesis which no one will defend. For it must be held to be impossible for a considerable number of Bishops to fall into heresy and obstinately adhere to their error in face of the tradition and arguments of the rest of the Episcopate,—a supposition quite utopian in its simplicity and innocence.

Not only, however, it is further alleged, has unanimity been always the practical rule of Councils, but Pope Pius IV. erected

* Commonitorium Vinc. Lerins., i. 2—3.

† Thirty-six Bishops refused to subscribe the ὁμοούσιον, and were condemned accordingly by a Council consisting of 150 Fathers.

the practice into a principle of jurisprudence. If a stranger to theology and church history were to light by accident on the passage in the history of the Council of Trent, which is here alluded to, doubtless he might easily fall into the mistake of supposing that Pius was referring obiter to a rule of law, instead of giving special directions for the particular conduct of a delicate and personal question. But if, getting interested in the story, he were to turn to the relation of what was said and done on another matter, no less delicate and no less hotly contested, he would perceive that he had mistaken the purport of the Pope's language. Let any one compare the passage of Pallavicino in which the historian summarizes, from the letters of the Cardinal-Secretary Borromeo,* the Pope's instructions to his Legates not to press for a definition of his relations to the Episcopate against the French opposition, with the words in which the Legates call upon the Fathers to vote on the question of residence. It is plain, if words have any meaning, that the unanimity required by Pius IV. was merely a regulation made to meet the exigencies of a special case, and was, in fact, a derogation from the ordinary law. The circumstances under which the Pope sent instructions to Trent that "those definitions only were to be made in which the Fathers should be of one mind," were briefly these. The French bishops were so determined in their opposition to the form of certain canons sent from Rome on the subject of Papal and Episcopal authority, and especially to the phrase in which the Pope was styled "ruler of the Universal Church," that an open rupture, ending in the dissolution of the Council, and perhaps a schism, was feared. In order to avoid so great a calamity, His Holiness agreed to accept the French amendments, with the exception of those which were opposed to the Papal rights as determined at Florence. He further suggested various verbal modifications of the canons in the French sense, and finally wound up his instructions on the point by saying that he would be content to have nothing expressed about his own power or that of Bishops, but only such decrees made as would gain the suffrages of all the Fathers. For the rest, provided the authority of the Apostolic See remained intact, the Legates were to do whatever they judged best for the service of God and the Church. And if they found that feeling still ran high, let them prorogue the session, and await the changes certain to be wrought by time.

The obvious interpretation of all this is, that for various reasons of expediency Pope Pius preferred to await the calming influence of time rather than push the particular question of his own prerogatives to a sudden issue. The obvious interpretation becomes necessary, when these instructions are compared with the Legates' categorical assertion that "this holy Council *has been always used to draw up its decrees according to the majority of voices.*" And it

* The illustrious S. Charles.

must be borne in mind that this declaration was made in the very act of putting to the vote a dogmatic question. There can be no doubt that the Legates expressed the rule, the Pope the exception. It will be worth while to write down in parallel columns the two passages from Pallavicino, in order that our readers may see, as well as understand, the force of the comparison.*

---

* We shall place in the first column a translation of the summary of the letters; in the second the formula used by the Legates:—

"The letters set forth that the Pope wished neither the dissolution of the Council nor a rupture with foreign nations. Various means were resorted to in order to satisfy, to the utmost possible extreme, not only the former proposals of the Cardinal of Lorraine, but also the subsequent requests of his French companions (*suoi Francesi*). And none appeared of difficult settlement except that of not granting to the Pope what had been attributed to him by the Council of Florence. . . . . It was added to all this that in order to avoid collision with the stubbornness of the opposition (dell' altrui), the words *to govern the Lord's own flock* might be put in place of the aforesaid (*i.e. Bishop of the Church Universal*) . . . . or even the simple phrase, *Church of God*, might be left without adding the word *universal* . . . . The conclusion was, that if even in this, there were found a difficulty insurmountable without a rupture, the Pope would be content that nothing should be expressed, either about his own power or that of the Bishops, those definitions only being made in which the Fathers should all agree in one opinion. In short, provided that the authority of the Apostolic See did not suffer, the Legates might do what they should judge to be the service of God and of Christianity. And if they saw feeling still bitter and action (trattati) violent, they were to put off the session and await the aid of time, the parent of changes, which is equally able, above every art, to change, now good into evil, now evil into good."

"Whereas many fathers have said that it ought to be declared that residence is *de jure divino;* whereas others have not spoken on that point; while others, again, have thought that such a declaration ought not to be come to. In order that the fathers who shall be chosen to draw up the decrees may be able to draw them up in more certain form (più sicuramente), your lordships will please declare, as shortly as possible, by the word *placet* or *non placet*, whether it is your wish or not that residence be declared *de jure divino:* to the end that the decrees may be written in accordance with the greater number of votes and opinions, according to the constant practice of this Holy Council. At present this number does not seem clear, on account of the variety of opinions. Your lordships will therefore speak clearly and distinctly, so that your opinions may be taken down."

Pallavicino, Storia del Concilio di Trento, lib. xix. cap. 15; lib. xiv. cap. 4. Ed. Roma, 1846.

We have not seen any other arguments adduced which seem to us to call for special notice. When it is said that the faith is a deposit in the custody of all the Churches, and that therefore the unanimous testimony of all the Churches is the sole test of the infallibility of an ecclesiastical judgment, the real theological reason for requiring unanimity in Councils is expressed; but the discussion is carried beyond its terms, and comes back (as we have already said) to the general question, whether the tradition of any particular church is indefectible, and its testimony therefore infallible: in other words to the real point at issue, viz., whether the Roman Pontiff is, or is not, infallible.

In the "Schema pro Infallibilitate Romani Pontificis," submitted to the Council by the North American Bishops, there was a passage which seemed to favour the unanimity theory. That sense, however, was promptly disavowed by the author of the Schema. The course of events even led him to change his original opinion, that the effervescence of men's minds on the Infallibility question made unanimity on that point morally necessary to the opportuneness of the definition.* As we are going to press, the appearance of a new pamphlet, asserting the necessity of unanimity, betokens that the changes are to be rung on this question, as they have been rung on Honorius and the False Decretals.† But, as we write, the Spirit of God, at the prayer of the faithful people, is moving over the troubled waters of human disputation, and before the ink is yet well dried, will have evoked light upon the face of the deep, shown the truth in its harmonious beauty, and "divided the light from the darkness."

---

* The following is the passage to which reference is made in the text. It occurs in the "Rationes ob quas schema . . . . magis expedire creditur." The whole is printed in our last number, pp. 502, sqq.

2°. "Plena hæc Patrum omnium (vel saltem fere omnium) consensio non solum expedit, sed omnino postulari videtur, quando agitur de capite doctrinæ definiendo: præsertim in re tanti momenti; quæ sane nemine (si id fieri possit) dissentiente definiri deberet.

3°. Hoc autem tempore ejusmodi unanimitas summopere necessaria videtur, ob voces in vulgus sparsas et ubique creditas, quibus magna inter Patres hac de re discordia esse perhibetur. Unanimis Patrum definitio hostibus nostris sic temere gloriantibus os penitus obstrueret, et maximam Ecclesiæ Dei ædificationem pareret. Profecto satis hostium externorum habemus, quin in ipsis Ecclesiæ castris nova dissidia excitemus, vel ullo modo fovere videamur."

Mgr. Dupanloup gave Dr. Spalding an opportunity of explaining this passage, and drew from that prelate the disavowal and expression of change of opinion mentioned in the text.

† The "Civiltà" of June 18th has, for the third time, returned to the discussion, in a long and exhaustive article in reply to the pamphlet referred to in the text. Bnt as the anonymous author of the pamphlet has not introduced any new matter into the controversy, we are dispensed from the necessity of taking any special account of his work.

III.

In April (p. 496, note) we drew our readers' attention to a remark of the "Civiltà Cattolica," on the inaccurate expressions occasionally and incidentally used by certain eminent Ultramontane writers, concerning the *extension* of infallibility. The "Civiltà Cattolica" evidently feels keenly on this matter; for it repeated the same remark on April 17th (p. 217); and now, in its number for June 4th, it has once more reverted to the same theme. "Some controversialists," it says (p. 597), "in disputing on the *subject* of infallibility, speak only by accident, and then with but little exactness on its *object;* with superfluous polemical restrictions or concessions; although elsewhere they explain their meaning more adequately."*

We heartily concur with the "Civiltà" in this opinion; and we will take the liberty of illustrating it from Dom Gueranger's admirable work "La Monarchie Pontificale." We are led to choose this eminent writer for our comment, not from any disparagement of his signal claim on the respect of all Catholics, but for the very opposite reason. His authority as a theologian is so high,—his replies to Mgr. Maret and Father Gratry are so triumphant and crushing,—his services to the good cause are so singularly great,—that there is the more danger to be dreaded from any incidental mistake of expression into which he may inadvertently fall. We will proceed, therefore, to explain what is the particular point to which we here refer.

It is the doctrine of all Ultramontanes without exception, that the Pope teaches ex cathedrâ only and always, when his intention is cognizable of imposing an obligation of absolute interior assent. But Dom Gueranger seems to think that this intention is never really cognizable unless it be expressly or equivalently stated in the document itself. In order that there may be an obligation on the faithful of giving the assent of Faith to a Council's doctrinal Decree, "*it is necessary that the terms of that Decree should indicate the intention of imposing an obligation*" (Monarchie Pontificale, p. 230). "It is *by the tenour of the definitive Act*, whatever it may be, that the Church knows with certainty the intention of that authority which speaks, and the extent of obligation imposed by that authority" (Ibid. p. 232).† For ourselves, on the

* Since this was in type, the subsequent number of the "Civiltà" has appeared; in which the extension of Infallibility is treated so powerfully and at such length, that we publish a translation of it in another part of our number.

† In one place (p. 231) Dom Gueranger uses language, the more obvious sense of which is to deny the Church's infallibility in minor censures, in dogmatical facts, and indeed in everything except Definitions of Faith. No one, of course, would be more horrified than Dom Gueranger himself at being credited with so heterodox an opinion; but

contrary, we regard a different doctrine as absolutely certain ; and indeed as one which cannot be denied without most serious results. We regard it as an absolutely certain and essential truth, that a Pope's or a Council's intention of obliging interior assent may be most completely known from extrinsic circumstances, though it be not directly or equivalently expressed in the pronouncement itself.

Indeed, on the surface, Dom Gueranger's theory is met by most formidable instances in opposition ; viz. by the very Creeds of the Church. If there be any infallible Rule of Faith in the world, indubitably by every Catholic the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds will be so accounted ; yet neither of them expresses, either directly or equivalently, the obligation of belief which it imposes. In its original form, no doubt, an anathema of two or three contemporary heresies was appended to the Nicene Symbol: but those anathemas only covered an extremely small portion of the dogma declared in the Symbol ; and, moreover, in the Constantinopolitan expansion which is now used they are entirely omitted. Similar remarks may be made on Pope Pius's Creed, which no Ultramontane regards as of less authority than the Tridentine Council itself. But as we are unable to discuss the question at the length which its importance deserves, we will on the present occasion attempt no more, than to show that, in other parts of his work, Dom Gueranger by no means hampers himself with that particular doctrine, which he has in one section incautiously expressed.

Indeed, when he is unsuspiciously contemplating history and not devising a theory, he is as far as possible removed from those, who would compress the catalogue of ex cathedrâ Acts within the smallest possible compass. On the contrary, we hardly know any theologian who includes so *many* Pontifical utterances in that category. He not only regards as ex cathedrâ the "Mirari Vos" (p. 141) and the "Quanta curâ" (Ib. and p. 34)—in regard to which we never doubted his opinion,—but he also so regards (p. 112) Boniface VIII.'s "Unam sanctam;"* nay, Nicholas III.'s

---

this very fact illustrates the carelessness of language into which he has permitted himself to fall. The sentence runs thus (p. 231):—"Bull, Brief, Decree—provided its promulgation be made—it matters not [which form be chosen]. But the Pontiff must manifest his decision to the Church by a direct Act, announcing his intention to pronounce on the question ; and must command the submission of faith, *qualifying the contrary opinion with the note of heresy*, and fulminating an anathema against those who should maintain it in future. The terms may vary, but *such is the condition of a Decree of Faith pronounced ex cathedrâ*." And the note, which Dom Gueranger appends, seems still more definitely to fix his words in the same sense. "For example," he says, "one may cite the Bull which defines the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. The words 'heretic,' 'excommunication,' or 'anathema,' are not there to be found ; still they are represented by equivalent terms," &c., &c.

* It is quite unintelligible to us how some excellent Catholics can have

"Exiit qui seminat" (p. 112). As to this latter Bull, Ultramontane controversialists, we believe, have hitherto almost universally denied that it was ex cathedrâ; though Dr. Ward, in his "Brief Summary," contended for that very view which Dom Gueranger has now adopted.

What we particularly wish however to point out is, that many Pontifical pronouncements, which Dom Gueranger admits to be ex cathedrâ, do not nevertheless express, either directly or equivalently, the obligation of interior assent which the respective Popes have by them intended to impose. This holds pre-eminently of the "Mirari Vos" and "Exiit," which we have already mentioned. It holds also pre-eminently of S. Leo's Letter to S. Flavian. This Letter is not only accounted ex cathedrâ by every individual Ultramontane theologian with the singular exception of Bellarmine, but is ordinarily used by Ultramontane controversialists as the one typical instance of an ex cathedrâ pronouncement. Yet this Letter contains no syllable, implying ever so distantly that S. Leo was intending to oblige the whole Church to accept its teaching. But in truth, among the various ex cathedrâ Acts recited by Dom Gueranger in p. 138, there are several others which entirely fail to fulfil his conditions of p. 231. Such are "S. Celestine's Decretal to the Bishops of Gaul for the condemnation of semi-pelagianism"; S. Leo's "Decretal addressed to S. Thuribius of Astorga against the errors of the Priscillianists"; S. Gregory II.'s "Decretal against the Iconoclasts"; not to mention (p. 139) many of those "numerous dogmatical definitions of Popes which have been inserted in the 'Corpus Juris' from the time of Alexander III." "Many" of these, adds Dom Gueranger, "are Letters to individuals; but their insertion in that official collection, intended for the entire Church, is *equivalent to a complete promulgation.*" The author here seems to admit the very principle for which we are contending; viz., that *extrinsic* circumstances may often suffice to establish the ex cathedrâ character of a Pontifical Act.

There is one further remark which it may be worth while to make. Dom Gueranger (pp. 194–197) lays very great and deserved weight on the formula prescribed by Pope S. Hormisdas to the Eastern Bishops. But this formula recognizes as ex cathedrâ "*all* the Letters of Pope Leo which he wrote concerning the Christian Religion." But no one will maintain that *all* these Letters express, either directly or equivalently, an intention of obliging the Universal Church.

---

doubted—as certainly they have doubted—the infallible authority of this Bull. The Civiltà of June 4th has quoted very opportunely its confirmation by the Œcumenical Fifth Council of Lateran. "For the salvation of souls, and the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff and this Holy See), and the unity and power of the Church we *renew and approve that Constitution* with the approval of *this present Council.*" (June 4th, p. 603.)

These brief remarks must suffice for the present, on a subject which in itself deserves far more lengthened treatment. But a circumstance has arisen, under which it seemed better to say little, than to be entirely silent on Dom Gueranger's statement.

Of the three questions discussed in this article, this last has far less obvious relation to the Council than have the two former; yet there is a very real relation notwithstanding, because the doctrine of Pontifical Infallibility has as yet so predominantly absorbed the attention of the assembled Fathers. In all human probability these lines will not long have met our readers' eye, before the hearts of innumerable devoted Catholics throughout Christendom will be unspeakably gladdened by receiving the long and earnestly-desired Definition of Pontifical Infallibility.

CONSTITUTIO DOGMATICA

De Fide Catholica.

PIUS EPISCOPUS, SERVUS SERVORUM DEI, SACRO APPROBANTE CONCILIO AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

Dei Filius et generis humani Redemptor Dominus Noster Jesus Christus, ad Patrem cœlestem rediturus, cum Ecclesiâ suâ in terris militante, omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem sæculi futurum se esse promisit. Quare dilectæ sponsæ præsto esse, adsistere docenti, operanti benedicere, periclitanti opem ferre nullo unquam tempore destitit. Hæc vero salutaris ejus providentia, cum ex aliis beneficiis innumeris continenter apparuit, tum iis manifestissime comperta est fructibus, qui orbi christiano e Conciliis œcumenicis ac nominatim e Tridentino, iniquis licet temporibus celebrato, amplissimi provenerunt. Hinc enim sanctissima religionis dogmata pressiùs definita uberiùsque exposita, errores damnati atque cohibiti ; hinc ecclesiastica disciplina restituta firmiusque sancita, promotum in Clero scientiæ et pietatis studium, parata adolescentibus ad sacram militiam educandis collegia, christiani denique populi mores et accuratiore fidelium eruditione et frequentiore sacramentorum usu instaurati. Hinc præterea arctior membrorum cum visibili Capite communio, universoque corpori Christo mystico additus vigor ; hinc religiosæ multiplicatæ familiæ, aliaque christianæ pietatis instituta ; hinc ille etiam assiduus et usque ad sanguinis effusionem constans ardor in Christi regno late per orbem propagando.

Verumtamen hæc aliaque insignia emolumenta, quæ per ultimam maxime œcumenicam Synodum divina elementia Ecclesiæ largita est, dum grato, quo par est, animo recolimus ; acerbum compescere haud possumus dolorem ob mala gravissima, inde potissimum orta, quod ejusdem sacrosanctæ Synodi apud permultos vel auctoritas contempta vel sapientissima neglecta fuere decreta.

Nemo enim ignorat, hæreses, quas Tridentini Patres proscripserunt, dum, rejecto divino Ecclesiæ magisterio, res ad religionem spectantes privati cujusvis judicio permitterentur, in sectas paullatim dissolutas esse multiplices, quibus inter se dissentientibus et concertantibus, omnis tandem in Christum fides apud non paucos labefactata est. Itaque ipsa sacra Biblia, quæ antea christianæ doctrinæ unicus fons et judex asserebantur, jam non pro divinis haberi, imo mythicis commentis accenseri cœperunt.

Tum nata est et late nimis per orbem vagata illa rationalismi seu naturalismi doctrina, quæ religioni christianæ utpote supernaturali instituto per omnia adversans, summo studio molitur, ut Christo, qui solus Dominus et Salvator noster est, a mentibus humanis, a vitâ et moribus populorum excluso, meræ quod vocant rationis vel naturæ regnum stabiliatur. Relictâ autem projectâque christianâ religione, negato vero Deo et Christo ejus, prolapsa tandem est multorum mens in pantheismi, materialismi, atheismi,

DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION

On the Catholic Faith.

PIUS, BISHOP, SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD, WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE SACRED COUNCIL, FOR PERPETUAL REMEMBRANCE.

Our Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, and Redeemer of Mankind, before returning to his heavenly Father, promised that he would be with the Church Militant on earth all days, even to the consummation of the world; wherefore he hath never ceased to be nigh to his beloved Spouse, to stand by her when teaching, to bless her when at work, and to aid her when in danger. And this, His salutary providence, which has been constantly displayed by other innumerable benefits, has been most manifestly proved by the fruits which Christendom hath derived in such abundance from Œcumenical Councils, and particularly from that of Trent, although it was held in evil times; for the result has been that the sacred dogmas of religion have been defined more closely, and set forth more fully, errors have been condemned and restrained, ecclesiastical discipline has been restored and more firmly secured, the love of learning and of piety has been promoted among the clergy, colleges have been established to educate youth for the sacred service, and the morals of the Christian world have been renewed by the more accurate training of the faithful, and by the more frequent use of the sacraments. Further results have been a closer communion of the members with the visible Head, and an increase of vigour in the whole mystical body of Christ, the multiplication of religious congregations and of other institutions of Christian piety, and that ardour in extending the kingdom of Christ throughout the world which never flags, and whose constancy braves death.

But while we recall with due thankfulness these and other signal benefits which the divine clemency has bestowed on the Church by the last Œcumenical Council, we cannot subdue our bitter sorrow for grave evils, which have been principally due to the fact that the authority of that sacred Synod has been contemned, or its wise decrees neglected by too many.

Everybody knows that the heresies proscribed by the Fathers of Trent, after rejecting the divine magisterium of the Church, and so surrendering to the judgment of each individual all matters regarding religion, gradually became dissolved into many sects, which disagreed and strove with one another, until at length not a few lost all faith in Christ. Even the Holy Bible, which used formerly to be declared the sole source and judge of Christian doctrine, began to be held no more divine, but to be ranked among mythical fictions.

Then arose, and too widely overspread the world, that doctrine of rationalism or naturalism which opposes in every way the Christian religion for being a supernatural institution, and works with the utmost zeal in order

barathrum, ut jam ipsam rationalem naturam, omnemque justi rectique normam negantes, ima humanæ societatis fundamenta diruere connitantur.

Hâc porro impietate circumquaque grassante, infeliciter contigit, ut plures etiam e catholicæ Ecclesiæ filiis a viâ veræ pietatis aberrarent, in iisque, diminutis paullatim veritatibus, sensus catholicus attenuaretur. Variis enim ac peregrinis doctrinis abducti, naturam et gratiam, scientiam humanam et fidem divinam perperàm commiscentes, genuinum sensum dogmatum, quem tenet ac docet Sancta Mater Ecclesia, depravare, integritatemque et sinceritatem fidei in periculum adducere comperiuntur.

Quibus omnibus perspectis, fieri qui potest, ut non commoveantur intima Ecclesiæ viscera? Quemadmodum enim Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri, et ad agnitionem veritatis venire; quemadmodum Christus venit, ut salvum faceret, quod perierat, et filios Dei, qui erant dispersi, congregaret in unum: ita Ecclesia, a Deo populorum mater et magistra constituta, omnibus debitricem se novit, ac lapsos erigere, labantes sustinere, revertentes amplecti, confirmare bonos et ad meliora provehere parata semper et intenta est. Quapropter nullo tempore a Dei veritate, quæ sanat omnia, testanda et prædicanda quiescere potest, sibi dictum esse non ignorans: "Spiritus meus, qui est in te, et verba mea, quæ posui in ore tuo, non recedent de ore tuo amodo et usque in sempiternum."

Nos itaque, inhærentes Prædecessorum Nostrorum vestigiis, pro supremo Nostro Apostolico munere veritatem catholicam docere ac tueri, perversasque doctrinas reprobare nunquam intermisimus. Nunc autem sedentibus Nobiscum et judicantibus universi orbis Episcopis, in hanc œcumenicam Synodum auctoritate Nostrâ in Spiritu Sancto congregatis, innixi Dei verbo scripto et tradito, prout ab Ecclesiâ catholicâ sancte custoditum et genuine expositum accepimus, ex hâc Petri Cathedrâ in conspectu omnium salutarem Christi doctrinam profiteri et declarare constituimus, adversis erroribus potestate nobis a Deo traditâ proscriptis atque damnatis.

CAPUT I.

DE DEO RERUM OMNIUM CREATORE.

Sancta Catholica Apostolica Romana Ecclesia credit et confitetur, unum esse Deum verum et vivum, Creatorem ac Dominum cœli et terræ, omnipotentem, æternum, immensum, incomprehensibilem, intellectu ac voluntate omnique perfectione infinitum; qui cum sit una singularis, simplex omnino et incommutabilis substantia spiritualis, prædicandus est re et essentiâ a mundo distinctus, in se et ex se beatissimus, et super omnia, quæ præter ipsum sunt et concipi possunt, ineffabiliter excelsus.

Hic solus verus Deus bonitate suâ et omnipotenti virtute non ad augendam suam beatitudinem, nec ad acquirendam, sed ad manifestandam perfectionem suam per bona, quæ creaturis impertitur, liberrimo consilio simul ab initio temporis utramque de nihilo condidit creaturam, spiritualem et corporalem, angelicam videlicet et mundanam, ac deinde humanam quasi communem ex spiritu et corpore constitutam.

Universa vero, quæ condidit, Deus providentiâ suâ tuetur atque gubernat, attingens a fine usque ad finem fortiter, et disponens omnia suaviter. Omnia

that, after Christ, our sole Lord and Saviour, has been excluded from the minds of men, and from the life and customs of nations, the reign of what they call pure reason or nature may be established. And after forsaking and rejecting the Christian religion, and denying God and his Christ, the minds of many have sunk into the abyss of Pantheism, Materialism, and Atheism, so that, denying rational nature itself and every rule of justice and rectitude, they endeavour to destroy the lowest foundations of human society.

Unhappily, it has yet further come to pass that, while this impiety was everywhere raging, many even of the children of the Catholic Church strayed from the path of true piety, and by the gradual diminution of the truths held by them, the Catholic sense became weakened in them, for, led away by various and foreign doctrines, wrongly confounding nature and grace, human science and divine faith, they are found depraving the genuine sense of the dogmas which Holy Mother Church holds and teaches, and endangering the integrity and the soundness of the faith.

At sight of all which, how can the Church fail to be deeply stirred? For, as God wills all men to be saved, and to arrive at the knowledge of the truth; as Christ came to save what had perished, and to gather together the children of God who had been dispersed, so the Church, constituted by God the mother and mistress of nations, recognizes herself as debtor to all, and is always prepared and attentive to raise those who fall, to support those who totter, to embrace those who return, to confirm the good and to carry them on to better things: wherefore she can never rest from testifying to and proclaiming the truth of God, which heals all things, knowing that it has been said to her, "My Spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, from henceforth and for ever" (Isaiah lix. 21). We, therefore, following the footsteps of our predecessors, have never ceased, as becomes our supreme Apostolic office, from teaching and defending Catholic truth, and reprobating perverse doctrines; and now, with the Bishops of the whole world seated with us and judging, after having been assembled in the Holy Spirit by our authority in this Œcumenical Council, relying on the Word of God written and handed down as we received it from the Catholic Church, holily kept and genuinely set forth, we have determined to profess and declare the salutary teaching of Christ from this Chair of Peter and in sight of all, proscribing and condemning contrary errors by the power given to us by God.

CHAPTER I.

OF GOD, THE CREATOR OF ALL THINGS.

The Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church believes and confesses that there is one true and living God, Creator and Lord of Heaven and Earth, Almighty, Eternal, Immense, Incomprehensible, Infinite in intelligence, in will, and in all perfection, who, as being one unique, absolutely simple, and incommutable spiritual substance, must be proclaimed as really and essentially distinct from the world, perfectly happy in Himself and from Himself, and ineffably exalted above all things which either are or can be conceived except Himself.

enim nuda et aperta sunt oculis ejus, ea etiam, quæ libera creaturarum actione futura sunt.

CAPUT II.

DE REVELATIONE.

Eadem sancta Mater Ecclesia tenet et docet, Deum, rerum omnium principium et finem, naturali humanæ rationis lumine e rebus creatis certo cognosci posse ; invisibilia enim ipsius, a creaturâ mundi, per ea quæ facta sunt, intellecta, conspiciuntur : attamen placuisse ejus sapientiæ et bonitati, aliâ, eâque supernaturali viâ se ipsum ac æterna voluntatis suæ decreta humano generi revelare, dicente Apostolo : "Multifariàm, multisque modis olim Deus loquens patribus in Prophetis : novissime, diebus istis locutus est nobis in Filio."

Huic divinæ revelationi tribuendum quidem est, ut ea, quæ in rebus divinis humanæ rationi per se impervia non sunt, in præsenti quoque generis humani conditione ab omnibus expedite, firmâ certitudine et nullo admixto errore cognosci possint. Non hâc tamen de causâ revelatio absolute necessaria dicenda est, sed quia Deus ex infinitâ bonitate suâ ordinavit hominem ad finem supernaturalem, ad participanda scilicet bona divina, quæ humanæ mentis intelligentiam omnino superant ; siquidem oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascendit, quæ præparavit Deus iis, qui diligunt illum.

Hæc porro supernaturalis revelatio, secundum universalis Ecclesiæ fidem, a sanctâ Tridentinâ Synodo declaratam, continetur in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quæ ipsius Christi ore ab Apostolis acceptæ, aut ab ipsis Apostolis Spiritu Sancto dictante quasi per manus traditæ, ad nos usque pervenerunt. Qui quidem veteris et novi Testamenti libri integri cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in ejusdem Concilii decreto recensentur, et in veteri vulgatâ latinâ editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis suscipiendi sunt. Eos vero Ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habet, non ideo quod solâ humanâ industriâ concinnati, suâ deinde auctoritate sint approbati ; nec ideo dumtaxat, quod revelationem sine errore contineant ; sed propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiæ traditi sunt.

Quoniam verò, quæ sancta Tridentina Synodus de interpretatione divinæ Scripturæ ad coercenda petulantia ingenia salubriter decrevit, a quibusdam hominibus pravè exponuntur, Nos, idem decretum renovantes, hanc illius mentem esse declaramus, ut in rebus fidei et morum, ad ædificationem doctrinæ Christianæ, pertinentium, is pro vero sensu sacræ Scripturæ habendus sit, quem tenuit ac tenet Sancta Mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum ; atque ideo nemini licere contra hunc sensum, aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari.

CAPUT III.

DE FIDE.

Quum homo a Deo tanquam Creatore et Domino suo totus dependeat, et atio creata increatæ Veritati penitùs subjecta sit, plenum revelanti Deo

This only true God, of His bounty and almighty virtue, not for the augmentation of His own happiness, nor for its acquisition, but to manifest His perfection by the blessings which He bestows on creatures, and of His perfectly free will, created out of nothing, at once, from the first beginning of time, both the spiritual and the corporeal creature, to wit, the angelical and the mundane, and afterwards the human creature, being constituted, as it were, common of soul and of body.

God protects and governs by His Providence all things which He hath made, "reaching from end to end mightily, and ordering all things sweetly" (Wisdom viii. 1). For all things are bare and open to His eyes, even those which are yet to be by the free action of creatures.

CHAPTER II.

OF REVELATION.

The same Holy Mother Church holds and teaches that God, the beginning and end of all things, may be certainly known by the natural light of human reason, by means of created things; for the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made (Romans i. 20), but that it pleased His wisdom and bounty to reveal Himself, and the eternal decrees of His will, to mankind by another and a supernatural way, as the Apostle says: God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all, in these days, hath spoken to us by His Son (Hebrews i. 1, 2).

It is attributable to this divine revelation that those among divine things which of themselves are not impervious to human reason can, even in the present condition of mankind, be known by all promptly, with firm certainty, and without any admixture of error. Not, however, for this reason is revelation to be called absolutely necessary; but because God of His infinite goodness ordained man to a supernatural end, viz., to be a sharer of divine blessings which utterly exceed the intelligence of the human mind: for eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man what things God hath prepared for them that love Him (1 Cor. ii. 9).

Further, this supernatural revelation, according to the universal belief of the Church, declared by the Sacred Synod of Trent, is contained in the written books and unwritten traditions which have reached us, having been received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or delivered as if by the hands of the Apostles, from the dictation of the Holy Spirit (Council of Trent, session iv., Decr. de Can. Script.). And these books of the Old and New Testament are to be received as sacred and canonical, in their integrity, with all their parts, as they are enumerated in the decree of the said Council, and are contained in the old Latin edition of the Vulgate. And the Church holds them sacred and canonical, not because, having been composed by human industry alone, they were afterwards approved by her authority, nor merely because they contain the revelation without error, but because, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author, and have been delivered as such to the Church herself.

And as the things which the Holy Synod of Trent decreed soundly concerning the interpretation of Divine Scripture, in order to curb rebellious

intellectûs et voluntatis obsequium fide præstare tenemur. Hanc vero fidem, quæ humanæ salutis initium est, Ecclesia catholica profitetur, virtutem esse supernaturalem, quâ, Dei aspirante et adjuvante gratiâ, ab eo revelata vera esse credimus, non propter intrinsecam rerum veritatem naturali rationis lumine perspectam, sed propter auctoritatem ipsius Dei revelantis, qui nec falli nec fallere potest. Est enim fides, testante Apostolo, sperandarum substantia rerum, argumentum non apparentium.

Ut nihilominus fidei nostræ obsequium rationi consentaneum esset, voluit Deus cum internis Spiritûs Sancti auxiliis externa jungi revelationis suæ argumenta, facta scilicet divina, atque imprimis miracula et prophetias, quæ cum Dei omnipotentiam et infinitam scientiam luculenter commonstrent, divinæ revelationis signa sunt certissima et omnium intelligentiæ accommodata. Quare tum Moyses et Prophetæ, tum ipse maxime Christus Dominus multa et manifestissima miracula et prophetias ediderunt, et de Apostolis legimus: "Illi autem profecti prædicaverunt ubique, Domino cooperante, et sermonem confirmante, sequentibus signis." Et rursum scriptum est: "Habemus firmiorem propheticum sermonem, cui bene facitis attendentes quasi lucernæ lucenti in caliginoso loco."

Licet autem fidei assensus nequaquam sit motus animi cæcus: nemo tamen evangelicæ prædicationi consentire potest, sicut oportet ad salutem consequendam, absque illuminatione et inspiratione Spiritûs Sancti, qui dat omnibus suavitatem in consentiendo et credendo veritati. Quare fides ipsa in se, etiamsi per charitatem non operetur, donum Dei est, et actus ejus est opus ad salutem pertinens, quo homo liberam præstat ipsi Deo obedientiami gratiæ ejus, cui resistere posset, consentiendo et cooperando.

Porro fide divinâ et catholicâ ea omnia credenda sunt, quæ in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur, et ab Ecclesiâ sive solemni judicio sive ordinario et universali magisterio tamquam divinitùs revelata credenda proponuntur.

Quoniam vero sine fide impossibile est placere Deo, et ad filiorum ejus consortium pervenire; ideo nemini unquam sine illâ contigit justificatio, nec ullus, nisi in eâ perseveraverit usque in finem, vitam æternam assequetur. Ut autem officio veram fidem amplectendi, in eâque constanter perseverandi satisfacere possemus, Deus per Filium suum unigenitum Ecclesiam instituit, suæque institutionis manifestis notis instruxit, ut ea tamquam custos et magistra verbi revelati ab omnibus posset agnosci. Ad solam enim catholicam Ecclesiam ea pertinent omnia, quæ ad evidentem fidei christianæ credibilitatem tam multa et tam mira divinitùs sunt disposita. Quin etiam Ecclesia per se ipsa, ob suam nempe admirabilem propagationem, eximiam sanctitatem et inexhaustam in omnibus bonis fœcunditatem, ob catholicam unitatem, invictamque stabilitatem, magnum quoddam et perpetuum est motivum credibilitatis et divinæ suæ legationis testimonium irrefragabile.

Quo fit, ut ipsa veluti signum levatum in nationes, et ad se invitet, qui nondum crediderunt, et filios suos certiores faciat, firmissimo niti fundamento fidem, quam profitentur. Cui quidem testimonio efficax subsidium accedit ex supernâ virtute. Etenium benignissimus Dominus et errantes gratiâ suâ excitat atque adjuvat, ad ut agnitionem veritatis venire possint; et eos, quos de tenebris transtulit in admirabile lumen suum, in hoc eodem lumine ut perseverent, gratiâ suâ confirmat, non deserens, nisi deseratur. Quocirca

spirits, have been wrongly explained by some men, We, renewing the said decree, declare this to be their sense, that, in matters of faith and morals appertaining to the edification of Christian faith and doctrine, that is to be held as the true sense of Holy Scripture which Holy Mother Church hath held and holds, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scripture; and therefore that is permitted to no one to interpret the Sacred Scripture contrary to this sense, or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

CHAPTER III.

ON FAITH.

Since man depends in his entirety upon God, as upon his Creator and Lord, and since created reason is absolutely subjected to uncreated truth, we are bound to yield to God by faith the obedience of our intelligence and will. And the Catholic Church teaches that this faith, which is the beginning of man's salvation, is a supernatural virtue, whereby, inspired and assisted by the grace of God, we believe that the things which He has revealed are true, not on account of the intrinsic truth of the things viewed by the natural light of reason, but on account of the authority of God himself who reveals them, and who can neither be deceived nor deceive. For faith, as the apostle testifies, is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not (Hebrews i, 11).

Nevertheless, in order that the obedience of our faith might be in harmony with reason, God willed that to the interior help of the Holy Spirit there should be joined exterior proofs of his revelation, viz., divine facts, and principally miracles and prophecies, which, while brilliantly displaying the omnipotence and infinite knowledge of God, are most certain proofs of His divine revelation, and suited to the intelligence of all. Wherefore, both Moses and the Prophets, and, most of all, Christ our Lord himself, were authors of many and most manifest miracles and prophecies; and we read of the Apostles: but they going forth preached everywhere, the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed (Mark xvi. 20). And again, it is written: we have the more firm prophetical word, whereunto you do well to attend, as to a light that shineth in a dark place (2 Peter i. 19).

But although the assent of faith is by no means a blind motion of the mind, still no man can adopt the Gospel teaching, as is necessary to obtain salvation, without the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who gives the sweetness of consent and belief in the truth. (Syn. Araus. II. can. 7.) Wherefore, Faith itself, even when it does not work by charity, is in itself a gift of God, and the act of faith is a work appertaining to salvation, by which man yields a free obedience to God, by consenting to and co-operating with His grace, which he might resist.

Further, all those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the Word of God, written or handed down, and which the Church, either by a solemn judgment, or by her ordinary and universal magisterium, proposes for belief as having been divinely revealed.

And since, without faith, it is impossible to please God, and to arrive at

minime par est conditio eorum, qui per cœleste fidei donum catholicæ veritati adhæserunt, atque eorum, qui ducti opinionibus humanis, falsam religionem sectantur ; illi enim, qui fidem sub Ecclesiæ magisterio susceperunt, nullam unquam habere possunt justam causam mutandi, aut in dubium fidem eamdem revocandi. Quæ cum ita sint, gratias agentes Deo Patri, qui dignos nos fecit in partem sortis sanctorum in lumine, tantam ne negligamus salutem, sed aspicientes in auctorem fidei et consummatorem Jesum, teneamus spei nostræ confessionem indeclinabilem.

CAPUT IV.

DE FIDE ET RATIONE.

Hoc quoque perpetuus Ecclesiæ catholicæ consensus tenuit et tenet, duplicem esse ordinem cognitionis, non solùm principio, sed objecto etiam distinctum : principio quidem, quia in altero naturali ratione, in altero fide divinâ cognoscimus ; objecto autem, quia præter ea, ad quæ naturalis ratio pertingere potest, credenda nobis proponuntur mysteria in Deo abscondita, quæ, nisi revelata divinitùs, innotescere non possunt. Quocirca Apostolus, qui a gentibus Deum per ea, quæ facta sunt, cognitum esse testatur, disserens tamen de gratiâ et veritate, quæ per Jesum Christum facta est, pronuntiat : " Loquimur Dei sapientiam in mysterio, quæ abscondita est, quam prædestinavit Deus ante sæcula in gloriam nostram, quam nemo principum hujus sæculi cognovit : nobis autem revelavit Deus per Spiritum suum : Spiritus enim omnia scrutatur, etiam profunda Dei. Et ipse Unigenitus confitetur Patri, quia abscondit hæc a sapientibus, et prudentibus, et revelavit ea parvulis.

Ac ratio quidem, fide illustrata, cum sedulò, piè et sobriè quærit, aliquam, Deo dante, mysteriorum intelligentiam eamque fructuosissimam assequitur, tum ex eorum, quæ naturaliter cognoscit, analogiâ, tum e mysteriorum ipsorum nexu inter se et cum fine hominis ultimo ; numquam tamen idonea redditur ad ea perspicienda instar veritatum, quæ proprium ipsius objectum constituunt. Divina enim mysteria suapte naturâ intellectum creatum sic excedunt, ut etiam revelatione tradita et fide suscepta, ipsius tamen fidei velamine contecta et quâdam quasi caligine obvoluta maneant, quamdiu in hâc mortali vitâ peregrinamur a Domino : per fidem enim ambulamus, et non per speciem.

Verùm etsi fides sit supra rationem, nulla tamen unquam inter fidem et rationem vera dissensio esse potest : cum idem Deus, qui mysteria revelat et fidem infundit, animo humano rationis lumen indiderit ; Deus autem negare seipsum non possit, nec verum vero unquam contradicere. Inanis autem hujus contradictionis species inde potissimum oritur, quod vel fidei dogmata ad mentem Ecclesiæ intellecta et exposita non fuerint, vel opinionum commenta pro rationis effatis habeantur. Omnem igitur assertionem veritati illuminatæ fidei contrariam omnino falsam esse definimus. Porro Ecclesia, quæ una cum apostolico munere docendi, mandatum accepit, fidei depositum custodiendi, jus etiam et officium divinitùs habet falsi nominis scientiam proscribendi, ne quis decipiatur per philosophiam, et inanem fallaciam.

copartnership with His children, therefore without faith no one has ever attained justification, nor will any one obtain eternal life, unless he shall have persevered in faith unto the end. And, that we may be able to satisfy the obligation of embracing the true faith and of constantly persevering in it, God hath instituted the Church through His only begotten Son, and hath furnished her with manifest notes of her institution, that she may be recognized by all as the guardian and the mistress of the revealed Word; for to the Catholic Church alone belong all those many and marvellous things which have been divinely established for the evident credibility of the Christain Faith. Nay more, the Church by herself, with her admirable propagation, her eminent holiness, and her inexhaustible fecundity of everything good, with her Catholic unity and her invincible stability, is a great and perpetual motive of credibility, and an irrefutable witness of her own divine mission.

And thus, like a standard set up to the Nations (Isaiah xi. 12), she both invites to her those who do not yet believe, and lets her children know that the faith which they profess rests on the strongest foundation. And her testimony is efficaciously supported by a virtue from above. For our most benign Lord gives His grace to stir up and help those who are astray, that they may arrive at a knowledge of the truth, and to those whom He has brought out of darkness into His own admirable light He gives His grace to strengthen them to persevere in that light, deserting none who desert not him; and therefore there is no parity between the condition of those who have adhered to the Catholic truth by the heavenly gift of faith, and of those who, led by human opinions, follow a false religion; for those who have received the faith under the magisterium of the Church can never have any just cause for changing or doubting that faith. Therefore, rendering thanks to God the Father who has made us worthy to share the light with the Saints, let us not neglect so great a blessing, but with our eyes fixed on Jesus, the author and consummator of our Faith, let us keep unalterably the confession of our hope.

CHAPTER IV.

OF FAITH AND REASON.

The Catholic Church with perpetual consent hath also held and holds that there is a twofold order of knowledge, distinct not only in principle but also in object; in principle, because we know in the first by natural reason, and in the second by divine faith; in object, because, besides those things to which natural reason can reach, there are proposed to us for our belief mysteries hidden in God, which, unless divinely revealed, cannot be known. Wherefore the Apostle, who testifies that God is known by the nations through created things, still, when discoursing of the grace and truth which come by Jesus Christ (John i. 17) says: We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, a wisdom which is hidden, which God ordained before the world unto our glory; which none of the princes of this world knew . . . but to us God hath revealed them by his spirit. For the spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God (1 Cor. ii. 7-9). And the only begotten Son himself confesses to the Father, because he has hid these things from the wise and prudent, and has revealed them to little ones (Matt. xi. 25).

Quapropter omnes christiani fideles hujusmodi opiniones, quæ fidei doctrinæ contrariæ esse cognoscuntur, maxime si ab Ecclesiâ reprobatæ fuerint, non solùm prohibentur tanquam legitimas scientiæ conclusiones defendere, sed pro erroribus potiùs, qui fallacem veritatis speciem præ se ferant, habere tenentur omnino.

Neque solùm fides et ratio inter se dissidere nunquam possunt, sed opem quoque sibi mutuam ferunt, cum recta ratio fidei fundamenta demonstret, ejusque lumine illustrata rerum divinarum scientiam excolat; fides vero rationem ab erroribus liberet ac tueatur, eamque multiplici cognitione instruat. Quapropter tantum abest, ut Ecclesia humanarum artium et disciplinarum culturæ obsistat, ut hanc multis modis juvet atque promoveat. Non enim commoda ab iis ad hominum vitam dimanantia aut ignorat aut despicit; fatetur imo, eas, quemadmodum a Deo, scientiarum Domino, profectæ sunt, ita si rite pertractentur, ad Deum, juvante ejus gratiâ, perducere. Nec sane ipsa vetat, ne hujusmodi disciplinæ in suo quæque ambitu propriis utantur principiis et propriâ methodo; sed justam hanc libertatem agnoscens, id sedulò cavet, ne divinæ doctrinæ repugnando errores in se suscipiant, aut fines proprios trangressæ, ea, quæ sunt fidei, occupent et purturbent.

Neque enim fidei doctrina, quam Deus revelavit, velut philosophicum inventum proposita est humanis ingeniis perficienda, sed tanquam divinum depositum Christi Sponsæ tradita, fideliter custodienda et infallibiliter declaranda. Hinc sacrorum quoque dogmatum is sensus perpetuo est retinendus, quem semel declaravit Sancta Mater Ecclesia, nec unquan ab eo sensu, altioris intelligentiæ specie et nomine, recedendum. Crescat igitur et multum vehementerque proficiat, tam singulorum, quam omnium, tam unius hominis, quam totius Ecclesiæ, ætatum ac sæculorum gradibus, intelligentia, scientia, sapientia: sed in suo dumtaxat genere, in eodem scilicet dogmate, eodem sensu, eâdemque sententiâ.

CANONES.

I.

De Deo rerum omnium Creatore.

1. Si quis unum verum Deum visibilium et invisibilium Creatorum et Dominum negaverit; anathema sit.

2. Si quis præter materiam nihil esse affirmare non erubuerit; anathema sit.

3. Si quis dixerit, unam eamdemque esse Dei et rerum omnium substantiam vel essentiam; anathema sit.

4. Si quis dixerit, res finitas, tum corporeas tum spirituales, aut saltem spirituales, e divinâ substantiâ emanasse;

aut divinam essentiam sui manifestatione vel evolutione fieri omnia;

aut denique Deum esse ens universale seu indefinitum, quod sese determinando constituat rerum universitatem in genera, species et individua distinctam; anathema sit.

5. Si quis non confiteatur, mundum, resque omnes, quæ in eo continentur,

Reason, indeed, enlightened by faith, when it seeks carefully, piously, and soberly, attains by God's gift some, and a very fruitful, understanding of mysteries, partly from the analogy of those things which it knows naturally, partly from the relations which the mysteries bear to one another and to the last end of man; but reason never becomes capable of apprehending mysteries as it does those truths which constitute its proper object. For the divine mysteries by their own nature so far transcend the created intellect that, even when delivered by revelation and received by faith, they remain covered with the veil of faith itself, and enveloped, as it were, in a certain mist, so long as we are pilgrims in this mortal life apart from God; for we walk by faith and not by sight (2 Cor. v. 7).

But although faith is above reason, there can still never be any true dissension between faith and reason, since the same God who reveals mysteries and infuses faith has bestowed the light of reason on the human mind, and God cannot deny himself, nor can truth ever contradict truth. The delusive semblance of this contradiction is mainly due, either to the dogmas of faith not having been understood and expounded according to the mind of the Church, or to the errors of opinions having been taken for the judgments of reason. We define, therefore, that every assertion contrary to a truth of enlightened faith is utterly false (Council of Lateran and Bull *Apostolici regiminis*). Further, the Church, which, together with the Apostolic office of teaching, has received the mandate to guard the deposit of faith, derives from God the right and the duty of proscribing false science, lest any should be deceived by philosophy and vain deceit (Coloss. ii. 8). Therefore all faithful Christians are not only forbidden to defend, as legitimate conclusions of science, such opinions as are known to be contrary to the doctrines of faith, especially if they have been reprobated by the Church, but are bound to hold them rather to be errors which wear a delusive semblance of truth.

And not only can faith and reason never be opposed to one another, but they mutually help one another; for right reason demonstrates the foundations of faith, and, enlightened by its light, cultivates the science of things divine, while faith frees and guards reason from errors, and furnishes it with manifold knowledge. So far, therefore, is the Church from opposing the cultivation of human arts and sciences, that it in many ways helps and promotes it; for the Church neither ignores nor despises the benefits to human life which result from the arts and sciences, but confesses that, as they came from God, the Lord of science, so, if they be rightly used, they lead to God by the help of His grace. Nor does the Church forbid that each of these sciences in its sphere should make use of its own principles and its own method, but, while recognizing this just liberty, she is sedulously on her guard, lest by repugning the divine teaching they become recipients of errors, or, transgressing their own limits, invade and trouble the domain of faith.

For the doctrine of faith which God hath revealed has not been propounded to be perfected by human talent, as a philosophical invention, but has been delivered as a divine deposit to the Spouse of Christ, to be faithfully kept and infallibly declared. Hence, also, that meaning of the sacred dogmas is perpetually to be retained which Holy Mother Church hath once declared, nor is that meaning ever to be departed from under the pretence or pretext

et spirituales et materiales, secundum totam suam substantiam a Deo ex nihilo esse productas ;

aut Deum dixerit non voluntate ab omni necessitate libera, sed tam necessario creasse, quam necessario amat seipsum ;

aut mundum ad Dei gloriam conditum esse negaverit ; anathema sit.

II.

De Revelatione.

1. Si quis dixerit, Deum unum et verum, Creatorem et Dominum nostrum, per ea, quæ facta sunt, naturali rationis humanæ lumine certo cognosci non posse ; anathema sit.

2. Si quis dixerit, fieri non posse, aut non expedire, ut per revelationem divinam homo de Deo, cultuque ei exhibendo edoceatur ; anathema sit.

3. Si quis dixerit, hominem ad cognitionem et perfectionem, quæ naturalem superet, divinitùs evehi non posse, sed ex seipso ad omnis tandem veri et boni possessionem jugi profectu pertingere posse et debere ; anathema sit.

4. Si quis sacræ Scripturæ libros integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout illos sancta Tridentina Synodus rencensuit, pro sacris et canonicis non susceperit, aut eos divinitùs inspiratos esse negaverit ; anathema sit.

III.

De Fide.

1. Si quis dixerit, rationem humanam ita independentem esse, ut fides ei a Deo imperari non possit ; anathema sit.

2. Si quis dixerit, fidem divinam a naturali de Deo et rebus moralibus scientiâ non distingui, ac propterea ad fidem divinam non requiri, ut revelata veritas propter auctoritatem Dei revelantis credatur ; anathema sit.

3. Si quis dixerit, revelationem divinam externis signis credibilem fieri non posse, ideoque solâ internâ cujusque experientiâ aut inspiratione privatâ homines ad fidem moveri debere ; anathema sit.

4. Si quis dixerit, miracula nulla fieri posse, proindeque omnes de iis narrationes, etiam in sacrâ Scripturâ contentas, inter fabulas vel mythos ablegandas esse : aut miracula certo cognosci nunquam posse, nec iis divinam religionis christianæ originem ritè probari ; anathema sit.

5. Si quis dixerit, assensum fidei christianæ non esse liberum, sed argumentis humanæ rationis necessario produci ; aut ad solam fidem vivam, quæ per charitatem operatur, gratiam Dei necessariam esse ; anathema sit.

6. Si quis dixerit, parem esse conditionem fidelium atque eorum, qui ad fidem unice veram nondum pervenerunt, ita ut catholici justam causam habere possint, fidem, quam sub Ecclesiæ magisterio jam susceperunt, assensu suspenso in dubium vocandi, donec demonstrationem scientificam credibilitatis et veritatis fidei suæ absolverint ; anathema sit.

of a deeper comprehension of them. Let, then, the intelligence, science, and wisdom of each and all, of individuals and of the whole Church, in all ages and all times, increase and flourish abundantly and vigorously, only after its own proper fashion, that is to say, in one and the same dogma, one and the same sense, one and the same opinion (Vincent of Lerins, Common. n. 28).

CANONS.

I.

Of God, the Creator of all things.

1. If any shall deny one true God, Creator and Lord of things visible and invisible ; let him be anathema.

2. If any shall not blush to affirm that besides matter there is nothing ; let him be anathema.

3. If any shall say that the substance and essence of God and of all things is one and the same ; let him be anathema.

4. If any shall say that finite things, both corporeal and spiritual, or at least spiritual, have emanated from the divine substance ; or that the divine essence by the manifestation and evolution of itself becomes all things ; or, in fine, that God is universal or indefinite being, which by determining itself constitutes the universality of things, distinct according to genera, species, and individuals ; let him be anathema.

5. If any confess not that the world, and all things which are contained in it, both spiritual and material, have been in their whole substance produced by God out of nothing ; or shall say that God created, not of his will free from all necessity, but as necessarily as he loves himself ; or shall deny that the world was made for the glory of God ; let him be anathema.

II.

Of Revelation.

1. If any shall say that the one true God, our Creator and Lord, cannot be certainly known by the natural light of human reason through created things ; let him be anathema.

2. If any shall say that it is impossible or inexpedient that man be taught by divine revelation of God and of the worship to be paid to him ; let him be anathema.

3. If any shall say that man cannot be divinely raised to a higher than natural knowledge and perfection, but can and should, by a continuous progress, arrive at length of himself to the possession of all that is true and good ; let him be anathema.

4. If any shall not receive as sacred and canonical the Books of Holy Writ, entire with all their parts, as the Holy Synod of Trent enumerated them, or shall deny that they have been divinely inspired ; let him be anathema.

III.

Of Faith.

1. If any shall say that human reason is so independent that faith cannot be prescribed to it by God ; let him be anathema.

IV.

De Fide et Ratione.

1. Si quis dixerit, in revelatione divinâ nulla vera et proprie dicta mysteria contineri, sed universa fidei dogmata posse per rationem rite excultam e naturalibus principiis intelligi et demonstrari ; anathema sit.

2. Si quis dixerit, disciplinas humanas eâ cum libertate tractandas esse, ut earum assertiones, etsi doctrinæ revelatæ adversentur, tanquam veræ retineri, neque ab Ecclesiâ proscribi possint ; anathema sit.

3. Si quis dixerit, fieri posse, ut dogmatibus ab Ecclesiâ propositis, aliquando secundum progressum scientiæ sensus tribuendus sit alius ab eo, quem intellexit et intelligit Ecclesia ; anathema sit.

Itaque supremi pastoralis Nostri officii debitum exequentes, omnes Christi fideles, maxime vere eos, qui præsunt vel docendi munere funguntur, per viscera Jesu Christi obtestamur, nec non ejusdem Dei et Salvatoris nostri auctoritate jubemus, ut ad hos errores a Sanctâ Ecclesiâ arcendos et eliminandos, atque purissimæ fidei lucem pandendam studium et operam conferant.

Quoniam verò satis non est, hæreticam pravitatem devitare, nisi ii quoque errores diligenter fugiantur, qui ad illam plus minusve accedunt ; omnes officii monemus, servandi etiam Constitutiones et Decreta, quibus pravæ ejusmodi opiniones, quæ isthic diserte non enumerantur, ab hâc Sanctâ Sede proscriptæ et prohibitæ sunt.

Datum Romæ in publicâ Sessione in Vaticanâ Basilicâ solemniter celebratâ anno Incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo octingentesimo septuagesimo, die vigesimâ quartâ Aprilis.

Pontificatûs Nostri anno vigesimo quarto.

Ita est.

JOSEPHUS,

Episcopus S. Hippolyti,

Secretaris Concilii Vaticani.

2. If any shall say that divine faith is not distinguished from natural knowledge of God and of moral things, and that therefore it is not requisite for divine faith that revealed truth be believed because of the authority of God, who reveals it; let him be anathema.

3. If any shall say that divine revelation cannot be made credible by outward signs, and therefore that men must be moved to faith by the solely internal experience of each, or by private inspiration; let him be anathema.

4. If any shall say that no miracle can be performed, and therefore that all narrations concerning them, even those contained in Holy Writ, are to be relegated among fables or myths; or that miracles can never be known with certainty, and that the divine origin of Christianity cannot be proved by them; let him be anathema.

5. If any shall say that the assent of Christian faith is not free, but is necessarily produced by the arguments of human reason; or that the grace of God is necessary for that living faith only which worketh by charity; let him be anathema.

6. If any shall say that the condition of the faithful and of those who have not yet arrived at the only true faith is equal, so that Catholics may have just cause for doubting, with suspended assent, the faith which they have already received under the magisterium of the Church, until they shall have obtained a scientific demonstration of the credibility and truth of their faith; let him be anathema.

IV.

Of Faith and Reason.

1. If any shall say that in divine revelation no true mysteries properly so called are contained, but that all the dogmas of faith can be understood and demonstrated from natural principles by properly cultivated reason; let him be anathema.

2. If any shall say that human sciences are to be treated with such freedom that their assertions, although they may be opposed to revealed doctrine, are to be retained as true, and cannot be proscribed by the Church; let him be anathema.

3. If any shall say that it may happen that sometimes, according to the progress of science, a sense is to be given to dogmas propounded by the Church different from that which the Church hath understood and understands; let him be anathema.

Therefore, fulfilling the duty of our supreme pastoral office, we entreat, by the bowels of Jesus Christ, and by our God's and Saviour's authority we command, all the faithful of Christ, and chiefly those who preside over them, or perform the office of teaching, that they will devote zeal and labour to ward off, and eliminate from, Holy Church these errors, and to spread the true light of pure faith.

And since it is not sufficient to shun heretical pravity, unless those errors also be diligently avoided which approach it more or less closely, we admonish all of the duty of also observing those constitutions and decrees by which those evil opinions of the like sort, which are not here enumerated at length, have been proscribed and prohibited by this Holy See.

PAPAL BRIEF.

THE HOLY FATHER has been graciously pleased to address the following Brief to Doctor Ward:—

PIUS P.P. IX.

DILECTE FILI, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.—Gratulamur tibi, dilecte fili, quod in filiorum Dei lucem vocatus, idem lumen aliorum mentibus offundere certes, et, in gremium sanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ receptus, sanctitatem ejus ostendere et illustrare studeas, supremique ejusdem Pastoris divinam asserere auctoritatem, vindicare prærogativas, jura omnia tueri. Nobilitatem in hoc videmus animi, qui ad veritatem maturo compulsus, examine eo incensiore ignis flagrat amore, quo majore contentione illam est adeptus; et eo impensiore nisu beneficium acceptum latius porrigere satagit, quo miseriorem, propria doctus experientia censet errantium conditionem. Indefessus autem labor quo pluribus ab hinc annis dona omnia ingenii, scientiæ, eruditionis, eloquentiæ tibi a Domino largita, confers ad religionis nostræ Sanctissimæ et hujus Apostolicæ Sedis causam propugnandam fidem, perspicue præfert inditam menti tuæ et charitatem in tuo corde diffusam, quibus urgeris ad redimendum præteritum tempus, et certamen imprudenter alias pro errore fortasse commissum rependendum per alacrem ac strenuam veritatis defensionem. Quoniam vero merces fidelis paratur seminanti justitiam, et qui ad eam erudiunt multos fulgebunt quasi stellæ in perpetuas æternitates, dum te tuum ita sertum texere gaudemus, te simul hortamur ut instes proposito tuo, et impigre præliari pergas prælia Domini, quo et plures semper ad viam veritatis adducas et splendidius tibi compares æternæ gloriæ pondus. Necessarias idcirco ad hoc vires tibi ominamur, copiosaque adprecamur gratiæ cœlestis auxilia et fausta omnia; eorumque auspicem et paternæ nostræ benevolentiæ pignus Apostolicam Benedictionem tibi peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romæ, apud Sanctum Petrum, die 4 Julii, anno 1870, Pontificatûs Nostri anno vicesimo quinto.

PIUS P.P. IX.

Dilecto Filio GEORGIO WARD.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS.

UNDER this head we will first give a translation of Cardinal Antonelli's letter to Count Daru. The original Italian of this letter will be found in the "Civiltà Cattolica" of May 21st. So much has been said lately about the "extreme views" to which Rome is supposed to be committed on the mutual relations of ecclesiastical and civil authority, that our readers will be glad to see an authentic statement of the true Roman doctrine on the subject.

But there is also another reason, entirely distinct, which has influenced us a good deal towards publishing the letter. It appears from it, that the report given in the "Augsburg Gazette," however discreditably obtained, was nevertheless perfectly correct, as to the proposed Canon, which is to be submitted to the Vatican Council for episcopal approbation, concerning the Church's extent of infallibility. It will be proposed to define, under sanction of anathema, that the Church's infallibility "extends not only to the Deposit of the Faith, but to all that is necessary for the preservation of such Deposit." And Cardinal Antonelli, while making the obvious remark that the Canon may possibly receive some "modification from the judgment and decision of the Episcopate," nevertheless declares that it is in itself no more than "the exposition of the maxims and fundamental principles of the Church; principles repeated over and over again in the Acts of former General Councils." Our readers will remember, that this doctrine was one of the principal theses for which we contended, in our recent controversy on the extent of infallibility. For ourselves we should be inclined to say that it was the most fundamental point at issue.

TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE APOSTOLIC NUNCIO AT PARIS.

Rome, March 19th, 1870.

MY LORD,—

The Marquis de Banneville, ambassador of his Majesty, read me a few days ago, a despatch forwarded to him under date the 20th of February last, from Count Daru, Minister of Foreign Affairs, relative to the affairs of the Council. In this communication, of which the ambassador was kind enough to leave me a copy, the aforesaid minister, referring to the resolution come to by the French Government not to take part in the deliberations of the General Council, desiring at the same time its liberty to be guaranteed fully and absolutely, states that such resolution was based on the supposition that that venerable assembly would occupy itself

solely about the sacred interests of the Faith, and would abstain from touching questions of a purely political order. But the publication (he says) by the "Augsburg Gazette," of the canons appertaining to the draft of constitution on the Church and on the Roman Pontiff, showing that there is question of deciding whether the power of the Church, and of her Head extends to the whole aggregate of political rights; the Government, keeping firmly to the resolution of leaving, upon this point also, entire liberty to the deliberations of the august assembly, intends to exercise the right given it by the Concordat of making known to the Council its opinion on questions of such nature.

Passing to the examination of the said canons, the minister sums up their contents (on which he wishes to comment) in the two following propositions:—First, "the Infallibility of the Church extends not only to the Deposit of Faith, but to all that is necessary for the preservation of such Deposit"; and secondly, "the Church is a society divine and perfect; its power is exercised at once *in foro interno et externo;* is absolute in the legislative, judicial, and coercive order, and is to be exercised by her with full liberty and independence from any civil power whatever." Hence, as corollaries of these two propositions, he deduces the extension of infallibility to all that is thought necessary for the defence of revealed truths, and consequently to facts, whether historical, philosophical, or scientific, external to revelation: as also the absolute subordination to the supreme authority of the Church, of the constituent principles of civil society; of the rights and duties of government; of the political rights and duties of citizens, whether electoral or municipal; of all that relates to the judicial and legislative order, as well in respect of persons as of things; of the rules of public administration; of the rights and duties of corporations. and in general, of all the rights of the State, not excluding the rights of conquest, peace, and war.

Next the minister passes on to note the profound impression which the simple enunciation of such doctrines must produce in the entire world; and asks at the same time how it could be possible for the bishops to consent to abdicate their episcopal authority, concentrating it in the hands of one alone; and how it could have been imagined that princes would lower their sovereignty before the supremacy of the Court of Rome.

Lastly, concluding, from all that has been set forth, that political and not religious interests are being discussed in the Council, Count Daru demands that the Governments be heard, or at least admitted to bear testimony to the characters, dispositions, and spirit (disposizioni di spirito) of the peoples they represent; and in particular that since France, by reason of the special protection which for twenty years she has exercised over the Pontifical State, has quite special duties to perform, he demands that the Government of that nation be permitted to exercise its right of receiving communication of projected decisions touching politics, and of requesting the delay necessary for bringing its observations before the Council, before any resolution be adopted by the same.

This is an abstract of the despatch communicated to me by the Marquis de Banneville. I have thought proper to inform your Lordship of it; with

the view, moreover, of communicating to you some short considerations which I think necessary to put in a clearer light the points touched upon by the minister, and to reply to the deductions made by him with respect to the points submitted to the deliberations of the Council.

And first, I cannot dispense myself from manifesting to your Lordship the satisfaction with which the Holy Father received the declaration expressed at the beginning of Count Daru's despatch, and repeated in the sequel, of the fixed intention of the French Government to respect, and cause to be respected, in any event, the full liberty of the Council, as well in the discussion of the constitution referred to as of all others which shall hereafter come to be proposed to the examination of the venerable assembly. This declaration, which does great honour to the Government of a Catholic nation, is considered by the Holy See as the natural consequence of that protection which, for more than twenty years, France has exercised towards it; a protection which has called forth several times public demonstrations of gratitude on the part of the Supreme Pontiff, who always, but especially at the present moment, cannot do less than recognize and appreciate all its importance.

But, coming closer to the object of Count Daru's despatch, I must say frankly that I am quite unable to understand (non mi è dato di comprendere) how the declarations contained in the draft of Constitution on the Church, and the respective canons—published in the "Augsburg Gazette" by a breach of the Pontifical secret—could have produced so grave and profound an impression on the mind of the French Cabinet, as to induce it to change the line of conduct which it had properly traced out for itself in regard to the discussions of the Vatican Council. The subjects treated in that draft of constitution, and in the canons appertaining to it, whatever modification they may undergo in the sequel from the judgment and decision of the Episcopate, are no more than the exposition of the maxims and fundamental principles of the Church; principles repeated over and over again in the Acts of former General Councils, proclaimed and developed in several Pontifical Constitutions, published in all Catholic states, and in particular in the celebrated dogmatic Bulls beginning, "Unigenitus," and "Auctorem Fidei," where all the aforesaid doctrines are generally confirmed and sanctioned; principles, finally, whichhave constantly formed the basis of teaching in all periods of the Church, and in all Catholic schools, and have been defended by an innumerable host of ecclesiastical writers, whose works have served for text in public schools and colleges, as well Government schools as others, without any contradiction on the part of the civil authority, but rather, for the most part, with the approbation and encouragement of the same.

Much less would it be possible for me to agree upon the character and extent given by the minister to the doctrines contained in the aforesaid canons. In virtue of them there is not attributed, either to the Church or the Roman Pontiff, that direct and absolute power over the whole aggregate of political rights, of which the despatch speaks; nor is the subordination of the civil to the religious power to be understood in the sense set forth by him, but in another order of quite different bearing.

And in truth the Church has never intended, nor now intends, to exercise any direct and absolute power over the political rights of the State. Having received from God the lofty mission of guiding men, whether individually or as congregated in society, to a supernatural end, she has by that very fact the authority and the duty to judge concerning the morality and justice of all acts, internal and external, in relation to their conformity with the natural and divine law. And as no action, whether it be ordained by a supreme power, or be freely elicited by an individual, can be exempt from this character of morality and justice, so it happens that the judgment of the Church, though falling directly on the morality of the acts, indirectly reaches over everything with which that morality is conjoined. But this is not the same thing as to interfere directly in political affairs, which, by the order established by God and by the teaching of the Church herself, appertains to the temporal power without dependence on any other authority. The subordination also of the civil to the religious power is in the sense of the pre-eminence of the sacerdotium over the imperium, because of the superiority of the end of the one over that of the other.* Hence the authority of the imperium depends on that of the sacerdotium, as human things on divine, temporal on spiritual. And if temporal happiness, which is the end of the civil power, is subordinate to eternal beatitude, which is the spiritual end of the sacerdotium, it follows that in order to reach the end to which it has pleased God to direct them, the one power is subordinate to the other. Their powers (I say) are respectively subordinate in the same way as the ends to which they are directed.

It results from these principles that, if the infallibility of the Church extends also (not, however, in the sense indicated by the French despatch) to all that is necessary to preserve intact the Deposit of Faith, no harm is thereby done to science, history, or politics. The prerogative of infallibility is not an unknown fact in the Catholic world; the supreme *magisterium* of the Church has dictated in every age rules of faith, without the internal order of States being thereby affected (risentirsene), or princes being disquieted thereat; rather, wisely appreciating the influence which such rules have on the good order of civil society, these have been themselves, from time to time, the vindicators and defenders of the doctrines defined, and have promoted, by the concurrence of the royal power, their full and respectful observance.

It follows, moreover, that if the Church was instituted by its Divine Founder as a true and perfect society, distinct from the civil power and independent of it, with full authority in the triple order, legislative, judicial, and coercive, no confusion springs therefrom in the march of human society, and in the exercise of the rights of the two powers. The competence of the one and the other is clearly distinct and determined, according to the end to which they are respectively directed. The Church

---

* We have no exact English equivalents for the abstract terms—*sacerdozio, impero.* "Sacerdozio" means the priestly office, and "impero" civil authority, in the most general sense.—(Note of Tr.)

does not, in virtue of her authority, intervene directly and absolutely in the constitutive principles of governments, in the forms of civil regulations, in the political rights of citizens, in the duties of the State, and in the other points indicated in the minister's note. But, whereas, no civil society can subsist without a supreme principle regulating the morality of its acts and laws, the Church has received from God this lofty mission, which tends to the happiness of the people; while she in no way embarrasses, by the exercise of this her ministry, the free and prompt action of governments. She, in fact, by inculcating the principle of rendering to God that which is God's, and to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, imposes at the same time upon her children the obligation of obeying the authority of princes for conscience sake. But these should also recognize that if anywhere a law is made opposed to the principles of eternal justice, to obey would not be a giving to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, but a taking from God that which is God's.

I proceed now to say a word on the profound impression which the minister expects will be made throughout the world by the mere enunciation of the principles developed in the draft of constitution which forms the object of his despatch. In truth it is not easy to persuade oneself how the doctrines contained in that draft, and understood in the sense above pointed out, can produce the profound impression of which the minister speaks; unless indeed their spirit and character be wrested, or that he speaks of those who, professing principles different from those professed by the Catholic Church, cannot of course approve of such principles being inculcated and sanctioned afresh. I say afresh; because the doctrines contained in that document, as I have already remarked, far from being new and unheard of, embrace no more (non sono nel loro complesso) than the reproduction of the Catholic teaching professed in every age and in every Church, as will be solemnly proved by all the pastors of the Catholic name, called by the head of the hierarchy to bear authentic witness, in the midst of the Council, to the faith and traditions of the Church Universal. It is to be hoped rather that the Catholic doctrine, once more solemnly confirmed by the Fathers of the Vatican Council, will be greeted by the faithful people as the rainbow of peace and the dawn of a brighter future. The object of confirming those doctrines is no other than to recall to modern society the maxims of justice and virtue, and thus to restore to the world that peace and prosperity which can only be found in the perfect keeping of the divine law. This is the firm hope of all honest men, who received with joy the announcement of the Council; this is the conviction of the Fathers of the Church, who have assembled with alacrity in such numbers at the voice of the Chief Pastor; this is the prayer which the Vicar of Jesus Christ is always sending up to God in the midst of the grievous troubles which surround his Pontificate.

For the rest I do not understand why the bishops should have to renounce their episcopal authority in consequence of the definition of Pontifical Infallibility. This prerogative is not only as ancient as the Church herself, but has been, moreover, always exercised in the Roman Church, without the divine authority and the rights conferred by God on the pastors of the

Church being thereby altered in the least degree. Its definition therefore would in no way go to change the relations between the bishops and their head. The rights of the one and the prerogatives of the other are well defined in the Church's divine constitution; and the confirmation of the Roman Pontiff's supreme authority and magisterium, far from being prejudicial to the rights of bishops, will furnish a new support to their authority and magisterium, since the strength and vigour of the members is just so much as comes to them from the head.

By parity of reason—the authority of the pastors of the Church being strengthened anew by the solemn confirmation of Pontifical Infallibility—that of princes, especially Catholic princes, will be no less strengthened. The prosperity of the Church and the peace of the State depend upon the close and intimate union of the two supreme powers. Who does not see then that the authority of princes not only will not receive any blow from the pontifical supremacy, but will instead find therein its strongest support? As sons of the Church they owe obedience, respect, and protection to the authority placed on earth by God to guide princes and peoples to the last end of eternal salvation; nor can they refuse to recognize that royal power has been granted them for the defence also and guardianship of Christian society. But by the very fact of the principle of authority receiving new vigour in the Church and in its head, the sovereign power must necessarily receive a new impulse, since it has from God a common origin, and consequently common interests also. And so, if the wickedness of the age, by separating the one from the other, has placed both in troublesome and painful conditions, to the great injury of human society, closer relations will unite both in indissoluble bonds for the defence of the grand interests of religion and society, and will prepare for them the way to a brighter and more prosperous future.

From what has been said up to this point it results clearly that the Counci; has not been called to discuss political interests, as the despatch of Count Daurl seems to indicate. We may conclude, therefore, that the French Government, finding no longer a sufficient reason for departing from the line of conduct it had set itself to follow in respect of the Council, will not desire to insist on the request for communication of the Decrees which will be submitted to the examination and discussion of the venerable assembly of bishops. On which point indeed it occurs to me to observe that the right claimed for his purpose by the minister on the ground of the Concordat in force between the Holy See and France, cannot, in my opinion, find any support in that act. In the first place, no special mention of this particular point is found in the articles of that convention. Then, further, the relations of Church and State on points belonging to both powers (punto di mista competenza) having been regulated by the Concordat, the decisions, which may be come to by the Vatican Council on such matters will in no way alter the special stipulations made by the Holy See, as well with France as with other governments, as long as these place no obstacles in the way of the full keeping of the conditions agreed upon. I may also add that if the Holy See has not thought fit to invite Catholic princes to the Council, as it did on other occasions, every one will easily understand that this is chiefly

to be attributed to the changed circumstances of the times. The altered state of the relations between the Church and the Civil Governments has made more difficult their mutual action in the regulation of things religious.

I desire however to hope that the Government of his Majesty the Emperor, fully satisfied with the explanations given by me in the name of the Holy See to the various points of Count Daru's despatch, and recognizing at the same time the difficulties in which the Holy Father might find himself, will not insist further on the demand of communication beforehand of the drafts of constitutions to be examined by the Fathers of the Council. Were such demand conceded, there would be question of things tending to embarrass the free action of the Council. Moreover, since the Church is keeping within the limits assigned to her by her Divine Founder, no anxiety need remain to the Government of his Majesty on account of the deliberations which may come to be adopted by the Episcopal assembly. Finally the French Government will thus give, by the very fact, a new proof of those dispositions of goodwill which it has manifested in respect of the full liberty of the Conciliar deliberations, and of the confidence which it declares it reposes in the wisdom and prudence of the Apostolic See.

Your Lordship will please read this despatch to Count Daru, as also leave him a copy.

Meanwhile receive, &c. &c.,

(Signed) G. CARD. ANTONELLI.

We next place before our readers some most important remarks of the "Civiltà" (June 18th) on the extension of the Church's Infallibility. It is admitted, of course, by all Catholics, that that Infallibility extends over the whole "materia fidei et morum," but some persons, from inadvertence, are far from realising the wide extent of this "materia." The "Civiltà," then, in reviewing the second edition of F. Knox's classical work, expresses itself as follows:—

We have much pleasure in announcing the second English edition, enlarged and improved, of the excellent work of F. Knox; and we should be glad to have to announce forthwith the second edition of the Italian translation, as soon as the first edition, which we praised at p. 349 of the last volume, is exhausted. As we then observed, though the work embraces all the questions which relate to infallibility, it treats more especially of the *object*, which is evidently the same both for the Pope and for the teaching Church.

After establishing once for all the *subject* of the infallible teaching office, the author places, in a clear light, the principle that the *object* of the Church's infallibility can only be learnt authentically from the Church herself, that is, from the *subject* of infallibility itself. As the Church, when she has proved her divine mission by the motives of credibility, proposes practically for our belief, as revealed among her other prerogatives, her infallibility, so it belongs to her to teach what is the object, what the limits, and what the extension of this infallibility; in other words, how far the promised assistance of the

Spirit of truth reaches; the more so since this must be contained in the deposit of the revelation intrusted to her.

And it is in this precisely that the peculiar merit of F. Knox's work consists. In order to ascertain when, how, and under what conditions the Church teaches infallibly, he interrogates specially the Church's practice, and from the living exercise of her teaching office, rather than from the various opinions of theologians, he deduces his replies to the different questions which arise relative to the *object* of infallibility.

"What is the object-matter," he asks, "of the Church's infallibility; *i.e.*, what precisely is the sphere within which she teaches infallibly? To reply to this question, we must consult the Church herself. She is God's ambassador. She alone knows the extent of her powers. We have admitted her credentials and accepted her as God's envoy. It is therefore only reasonable that we should believe her word in what she tells us about the object and scope of her mission. Whatever she declares to be within the province of her infallibility as our teacher, must be within it. If we prove that she has claimed to speak infallibly on any point, we have proved that she has spoken infallibly upon it. Now the Church does not derive her powers from a written document. She came into existence as a living and energizing institution. There was, therefore, no need for her to begin by defining accurately the extent of her authority. She declared the powers which she possessed by using them. Thus, in God's providence, the course of events has served to exhibit, with increasing definiteness, the full extent of the Church's infallible authority as teacher, and to mark out more and more accurately the field over which it ranges" (p. 49).

Hence, according to the practical sense of the Church, he points out that, speaking generally, the object of infallibility is contained in the general formula *in rebus fidei et morum*. From the words spoken by Christ to the Apostles, All truths (John xvi. 13), all that I have said to you (John xiv. 26), all that I have commanded you (Matth. xxviii. 18);—"*i.e.*, the whole ecomony of salvation, all, namely, that men have to believe and do in order to attain eternal life, falls under the Church's authority as teacher, and, therefore, under her infallibility. Hence has come the common definition that the Church is infallible in all that she teaches regarding faith and morals, since faith refers to what we must believe, and morals to what we must do. And the definition is a correct one, provided care be taken to explain that by matters of faith and morals are meant, not only the truths directly revealed by our Blessed Lord to His Apostles, whether explicitly or implicitly, but also *every other branch of truth, speculative or practical, which has any bearing upon revealed truth*. On the other hand, if the words faith and morals are so interpreted as to confine the Church's infallibility to revealed truth exclusively, the definition becomes false and dangerous" (pp. 51, 52).

This, he adds, *was what the Jansenists wished to do.*

"From what has been said," he continues, "it is evident that the sphere of the Church's infallible teaching is very extensive, and embraces a great many different subjects, since *there can be very few branches of truth which have not some connection with revealed dogma*. This, however, will appear still more clearly when we examine in detail the object-matter of her teaching office" (p. 54).

The author next examines particularly, one by one, the matter of the Church's infallible teaching, taking specially into account the actual practice of the Church, and holding firmly to the principle that if the Church attributes to herself infallibility in regard to the object of her teaching, she cer-

tainly does not usurp this prerogative, but possesses it. The primary and immediate object of infallibility is undoubtedly revealed truth; but though the relation in which other truths stand to this, the Church judges infallibly concerning them, as a secondary and mediate object. The author classes them as follows :—1. Truths contained explicitly or implicity in revelation. 2. General principles of morality, including natural morals. 3. Dogmatic and moral facts, as the sense of a book in relation to the faith, the canonization of saints, constitutions relative to general ecclesiastical discipline and worship, the approbation of religious orders, the condemnation of certain societies, the approval or condemnation of certain systems of education, etc. 4. Political truths and principles. 5. Theological conclusions. 6. Philosophical and scientific conclusions in their relation to dogma or morals. After discussing these heads separately, he thus summarizes them in the following formula :—

"The object-matter of the Church's infallibility embraces, primarily and directly, all revealed truth, whether explicitly or implicitly contained in the revealed deposit; and secondarily, and indirectly, *all natural truths, both of fact and speculation, which stand in such relation to revealed truth that error concerning them would tend to impair the integrity of the faith in the minds of Christians and to imperil their eternal salvation*" (p. 81).

Throughout the whole of this particular examination into the object of infallibility, the author, while reasoning theologically, has his eye chiefly fixed upon the actual practice of the Church, whom he has ever before him, as a teacher, not after the fashion of an uncertain abstraction, but as a living person.

In going through the different heads, he draws attention to the more or less evident relation in which many parts of the Church's teaching stand to the Deposit of the Faith, on which is founded the Church's right to teach us infallibly; and, above all, he points out that the Deposit of the Faith is always the norm and rule by which the Church judges of the truth or falsehood of non-revealed doctrines, whether philosophical or political, and which she therefore regards from no other point of view except that of dogma and morals.

"She forms her judgment concerning them, not by working over again the process which the philosopher had gone through, and thus discovering where his error lay, but by comparing his results with revealed truth and estimating them accordingly. Thus, one who sees corrects at a glance the faulty conclusions which a blind man has slowly and painfully arrived at, by touch and hearing, regarding the shape and position of certain objects. This he does not by touch and hearing, but by another sense—sight, of which the blind man is destitute. In like manner the Church, whose eyes are opened to the light of faith, is able, by the aid of this supernatural light, to declare infallibly that a philosophical system, or proposition, or book is unsound; and she has many times in the course of her history exercised this power when her children's needs required it" (pp. 76, 77).

He inculcates once again the same principle, when he speaks of the nature of doctrinal condemnations :—

"What," he asks, "is the Church's standard by which she tests and condemns faulty doctrines? It can only be the Deposit of the Faith, including in this, of course, the general principles of the moral law. For

she has no other standard by which to judge but this; and it is only from the point of view in which a given doctrine has a bearing upon revealed truth, and is therefore commensurable with it, that she regards it as subject to her jurisdiction. The Church's doctrinal condemnations are therefore equivalent to formal pronouncements that the particular doctrines she condemns are at variance in one point or other with the Catholic Faith. The various modes in which they may stand opposed to the faith are expressed by a more or less fixed terminology; and a proposition is said to have been censured, when sentenced has been pronounced upon it indicating that it is out of harmony with the faith" (pp. 99, 100).

At this point it is natural to inquire whether the *object* of the Church's infallibility in pronouncing such censures is to be restricted to the censures of heresy, or should be extended to the minor censures. The author deduces his answer from the same principle of the Church's practical teaching:—

"The Church, in the exercise of her office of teacher, claims the power not only of declaring infallibly that a given doctrine is in opposition to the revealed deposit, but of determining, if she pleases, the exact degree and kind of this opposition. In other words, she asserts her right to assign properly to each proposition which she condemns the censure which belongs to it. The particular way, however, in which she has exercised this power has varied at different periods of her history" (pp. 100, 101).

"The same reasons," the author remarks, "which go to prove that we are bound to conform ourselves interiorly to what the Church declares to be immediately opposed to the faith, show with equal force that we are bound to submit ourselves in like manner to her pronouncements when she defines that a doctrine only indirectly deviates from the faith, and so deserves a censure less than heretical. There is no rational ground for a distinction between these two cases, unless we deny her infallibility as teacher in regard to lesser deviations from the faith, while admitting it in respect of the highest kind of deviation. She herself, however, practically rejects this distinction, by requiring from us, under pain of sin, the same submission in the one case as in the other. And since what she claims she has a right to claim, from her practice we may legitimately infer her infallibility."

[This passage occurs at p. 75 of the first edition of F. Knox's book, but, the chapter containing it having been recast in the second edition, the precise words are not now to be found there, though the argument which they express remains unchanged.—Ed. D. R.]

So again on the same principle of the different practice of the Church, the *object* of infallibility is not to be restricted to the use of certain formalities and conditions; for example, the threat of anathema, which some theologians require to be appended to the definitions either of the Sovereign Pontiff or of the teaching Church:—

"The shape in which these pronouncements are cast, and the formalities by which they are accompanied, are merely accidental circumstances, which admit of considerable variation. That which makes these utterances infallible, and is at the same time the *only sign by which we may know that they are infallible*, is the will and intention of the Sovereign Pontiff to teach by means of them the universal flock, with the authority that belongs to him as its divinely constituted Pastor" (p. 62, 1st edition).

In like manner it depends upon the Church to determine what obligation she imposes upon the faithful. Sometimes it will be merely a disciplinary obligation of silence, without defining the question. But if the Church or the Pope passes a decisive doctrinal sentence, a respectful silence or a so-

called provisional assent will not suffice. An internal assent, under pain of mortal sin, is requisite, and this must be either an assent of divine faith immediately, if the thing is proposed for belief as revealed, or else an assent of *intellectual obedience* to the divine teaching authority of the Church, and therefore of divine faith mediately, if the thing is proposed as true owing to its connection with revelation, of which the Church is the infallible guardian.

Thus, by the help of this fundamental principle of the practical teaching of the Church, F. Knox solves with great simplicity and soundness all the questions which relate to the object of infallibility, and the obligations of the faithful towards the teaching Church :—

"As we did not choose the Church for our teacher, nor give her authority to teach us, so neither can we set limits to her teaching, nor free ourselves from the obligation of obeying her. Her power comes from Christ, whom she represents. And since He has put no restriction on the obedience which she can claim from us, it follows that whatever she bids us do we are bound to do, and whatever she bids us believe we are bound to believe. *Our obedience to her must be absolute, unbounded, and unreasoning, as to the voice of God Himself*" (pp. 103, 104).

F. Knox has sought to explain in a simple, positive, and uncontroversial manner the whole doctrine regarding infallibility, and he has succeeded admirably. In preference to reasonings and controversies, and the opinions of theologians, he has attached himself to the acts of the teaching Church and the Pope down to our own time ; that is to say, he has gathered together what the teaching Church and the Pope, on the *subject* of infallibility, has declared concerning the *object* of infallibility and the questions connected with it. Hence he has not confined infallibility, as is sometimes done by certain theologians, chiefly for the convenience of controversy, within narrow and arbitrary boundaries, now limiting the object of infallibility, now the conditions, now the obligations, or again leaving questions undetermined ; but he has set forth the whole truth in its entirety according to the practical teaching of the Church. He concludes with showing the practical importance of holding the whole doctrine of the Church with respect to her infallible teaching office, and the intellectual and moral injury which results from limiting the Church's authority as regards the *object* of infallibility to matters strictly of faith, and thus considering *philosophy, politics, and education in the light of things wholly secular, and altogether external to the infallible teaching office of the Church.* In truth the extent of the *object* of infallibility *is in some respects a question of more practical consequence than that which is so much debated at present concerning the subject*, though both are of vital importance. Hence the book deals more with the primary, and especially the secondary *object* of infallibility, than with the *subject ;* that is, the Episcopate and the Pope, though in this second edition the question of the Pope's infallibility is treated of anew and with greater fulness, as present circumstances require. But we will speak of this if another edition of the Italian translation should appear. Meanwhile we have already dwelt too long upon the object of infallibility, either epitomizing or giving extracts from the first edition, as we could not have expressed these doctrines more compendiously or in more appropriate language.

Notices of Books.

The Pope and the Church considered in their Mutual Relations. By the Rev. Paul Bottalla, S.J.

WE much regret that we are prevented, by circumstances of which our readers are aware, from giving this admirable volume that careful review in our present number, which we had fully intended; but we trust to supply the deficiency in October. Father Bottalla has written what is indubitably by far the ablest and most complete defence of Pontifical Infallibility, which has appeared in any part of the Church during the present controversy. It is impossible however to place before our readers any exhibition of his reasoning, without analyzing *the whole:* and this task, of course, we must defer to our future article. Here therefore we will confine ourselves to quoting the conclusion at which he finally arrives:—

"The opinion of Papal fallibility is in itself not only erroneous but heretical, though not yet authentically declared as such by the Church. It directly contradicts the universal doctrine of the whole Church, which is infallible and irreformable. It has been often objected that the Penitentiaria, in its answers of Sep. 14 and of Dec. 13, 1831, declared that those who still held the doctrine of the Fourth Article of the Declaration could be admitted to the Sacrament of Penance and absolved. But they who urge this objection fail to remark (1) that the Congregation expressly puts as a condition that they should hold that opinion 'ex bonâ fide et ex animi persuasione,' and (2) that the Congregation also declared that the confessor has in his power to refuse absolution in such cases if he 'aliter judicet ex circumstantiis in peculiari casu occurrentibus.' That is to say, the Congregation admits that to hold the erroneous opinion is a grievous sin, from which bona fides alone can excuse, and consequently that only on account of their bona fides can defenders of that error be admitted to sacramental absolution. But in our day, except in the case of a most supine ignorance or of great want in mental power, we cannot easily find many instances of bona fides: especially at the present moment, when the Church has solemnly manifested its doctrine by the nearly unanimous voice of all its bishops, in union and in perfect harmony with the supreme magisterium of the Apostolic See. Consequently, even now, irrespective of any proceeding of the Vatican Council now pending, not only is it lawful for any Catholic to condemn the adverse opinion as erroneous, scandalous, proximate to heresy, and heretical in itself, according to the example of the greatest theologians; but it is the duty of every educated Catholicto believe and to profess that it deserves these qualifications. *To censure Catholics because they make public this profession of Catholic faith is nothing but intolerable temerity*" (pp. 383, 384).

The present volume is entirely confined to the "subject" of infallibility,

the author (p. 384) promising to treat in a future volume the *extension* of that prerogative. Nothing however can be more admirable, than his incidental remarks on the nature of an ex cathedrâ Act. For instance :—

"For a Pontifical Letter to be a teaching ex cathedrâ, it is required that the Pope, either formally *or implicitly*, should speak to the Universal Church, *though he may have addressed his Missives to a particular Bishop in a particular diocese*. . . . . It follows that a definition ex cathedrâ must formally, or *at least implicitly*, import the obligation of an absolute assent to it on the part of the faithful throughout the Church" (pp. 263, 264).

The italics are our own, as also in the following quotation :—

"When we say that the Pope has spoken ex cathedrâ, we mean that he has really spoken in his capacity of Universal Doctor and Teacher of the Church, divinely appointed to guide and confirm it in the path of faith. When the Roman Pontiff resolves to grant to the Church some particular Rule of faith or morals, it is necessary that the knowledge of his intention should be conveyed into the mind of the Faithful *by some of those signs which may suffice to make the inward intention known*. First, there are certain solemn formulæ, which are never employed in any Papal utterance except in cases where the Pontiff intends to speak ex cathedrâ. When, therefore, he uses these forms, no doubt can exist that he exercises his infallible ministry of Universal Teacher. But, secondly, it is not true that the Pope is bound to observe strictly either those solemn formulæ which are consecrated to the purpose of conveying an infallible decision ex cathedrâ, nor even to employ any particular external form in his Missives. It is therefore indifferent whether the Pope, speaking in his capacity of Universal Teacher of the Church, uses the medium of Bull, or Encyclical, or Constitution. There are many Bulls which deal exclusively with matters which no way touch faith, and there are many Encyclicals which are evidently utterances ex cathedrâ ; such as the 'Mirari vos' of Gregory XVI. and the 'Quanta curâ' of Pius IX. . . . . Finally, that the Pope should speak ex cathedrâ, it is not necessary that he should always directly define a doctrine *de fide*, and condemn the contrary error as *a heresy*. Should such be the case, we ought to exclude, from the list of the utterances ex cathedrâ, many Pontifical Bulls published since the Council of Constance ; and assert that the Pope speaking ex cathedrâ cannot condemn any error with minor censures. Many Papal Bulls, of which the 'Auctorem fidei' of Pius VI. is an instance, prove the contrary. At all events, speaking generally, the Church has always understood when the Pope has intended to speak ex cathedrâ in matters of faith, and all have submitted to his decisions with the interior assent of their mind. If, in some particular instances, doubt might arise among Catholics as to the intention of the Roman Pontiff, the Church affords various means of removing this uncertainty by authentic declarations" (pp. 385-8).

To the former of the above quotations Father Bottalla very kindly appends the following note :—

"In this matter we agree perfectly with the view of Dr. Ward, expressed by him especially in his Thesis X. "de Infallibilitatis Extensione," p. 33, seq." (p. 386, note).

Father Bottalla does not seem to have fallen in with Dr. Murray's conclusive and powerful treatise on S. Peter's supremacy, in the "Irish Annual Miscellany." He would have found in it a very strong corroboration to the argument which he derives from the word "Petrus."

When does the Church speak infallibly? By THOMAS FRANCIS KNOX, of the Oratory. Second Edition. London: Burns, Oates, & Co.

WE are truly delighted to find that a second edition has been called for of Father Knox's admirable work; for we heartily agree with the "Civiltà Cattolica" that on the whole it is the most complete and orthodox exposition of the Church's integral doctrine on Infallibility which has appeared in any part of Christendom. He has taken advantage of the opportunity to make very considerable additions, especially with reference to circumstances of the moment. We conclude with two or three quotations taken from the new matter.

"Throughout the long course of eighteen centuries, not a single instance can be adduced of any one, whether bishop or layman, having refused submission to a dogmatic decree of the Sovereign Pontiff without being looked upon in consequence as guilty of grave sin" (p. 30).

"Nothing is clearer, from the whole history of the Church, than that the Sovereign Pontiffs have never tolerated any practical doubt of their infallibility on the part of the faithful, but have exacted from all the most unreserved submission to whatever they might decree. But they have gone beyond this, for they would not suffer without a protest their decrees to be judged by the bishops of the Church, even though the judgment resulted in an act of submission. 'Who has constituted you judges over Us?' Clement XI. wrote to the bishops of France (A.D. 1706), 'Does it belong to inferiors to pass decrees about the authority of their superior and to examine his judgments? Ask your forefathers, and they will tell you that it is not the part of individual bishops to discuss, but to fulfil, the decrees of the Apostolic See. Assuredly if you had considered the form of Our Apostolic constitution, which was not devised by Us, but has been used by Our predecessors through a long series of ages, you would have seen that We neither asked your counsel, nor requested your suffrages, nor waited for your opinon; but We enjoined upon you obedience—that obedience, namely, which at your consecration you promised by a solemn oath to pay to the Blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the Holy Roman Church, and Us and Our Apostolic mandates'" (p. 31).

"Condemned virtually again and again by the Church; repudiated by the overwhelming majority of Catholics; leading, if acted upon, to heresy and schism; opposed to the tradition and teaching of the Apostolic See; stigmatized by theologians as heretical or erroneous; unknown for fourteen centuries in the Church; begotten in times of disunion and bewilderment; nursed by lawyers and statesmen as a weapon against the Vicar of Christ; imposed on a reluctant clergy by a tyrannical king; the new-found ally of modern liberalism; illogical and self-contradictory as a system;—Gallicanism has lived ignobly and will die ignobly. A year ago it seemed an extinct thing—the relic of a past age, when suddenly, amid the plaudits of the anti-Christian press of Europe, it was galvanized into the semblance of a momentary vitality, and at once proved itself to be the same that it ever had been, by the noisy disloyalty of its behaviour towards the Apostolic See. But the times are altered. The relations of Church and State are not what they once were. Monarchs, if they have the will, have no longer the power, to shield from formal condemnation this pernicious error. Its unexpected resuscitation, and the new manifestation of its spirit and ten-

dencies, which has astonished and scandalized the faithful, will be its death-warrant. Many who might have wished it let alone, as not worth a formal condemnation, now desire, with good reason, that it may be crushed for ever. Hence it is that all eyes are fixed upon the Fathers of the Church now gathered in Œcumenical Council round the Chair of Peter at Rome, in prayerful expectation that, ere long, a decree may thence go forth relegating this evil doctrine to the outer darkness of heresy, and proclaiming as a dogma of the faith that the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on earth, cannot err from the truth, whenever in his Master's name and authority he teaches the Universal Church" (p. 38).

S. Joseph and the Vatican Council. By Rev. Father Gallwey, S.J. London: Burns & Oates.

THE only adverse criticism which we are tempted to make on this admirable pamphlet is, that the connexion of *S. Joseph* with its argument is not (to us at least) very apparent. Otherwise we have nothing to express but praise and gratitude, and we will at once proceed to give our readers some little taste of Father Gallwey's quality. One strange objection has been made against the doctrine of Pontifical Infallibility, founded on the supposition that the Church may at some future time be perfectly flooded with infallible definitions. We cannot better reply to this objection than in Father Gallwey's words:—

"Even if the exaggerated foreboding should have its fulfilment, so that the time should come when we might expect some new definition every morning, yet so long as the watchful providence of God is pledged not to suffer any false oracle to emanate from the Apostolic See, such daily pronouncements, so far from being an evil, would be like the daily provision of manna. *Who will say that it is a curse to have truth in abundance?* The Psalmist cries out, 'Save me, O Lord, for truths are dying out' (Psalm xi.), but I know of no inspired text that cautions us against *knowing too much of truth.* Life eternal, our Blessed Saviour tells us, consists in this, that we know His Father and Himself. And we are often reminded of that truth which blessed S. John sets before us, that when we know God fully we shall necessarily become like to Him. If this be so, as it surely is, how can it be an evil to have our errors corrected, and to learn more and more of God's truth, for each truth is a foretaste of Heaven?"

It is objected again "that the Popes, as soon as they find themselves infallible, will become bold and grasping." Father Gallwey replies:—

"To the Popes, at least, the definition, if pronounced, will teach nothing new. I say 'at least to the Popes,' because in reality I believe that to the great mass of the Catholic people throughout Christendom the definition will bring no change of thought or sentiment. I have before me a familiar letter, written without study—an expression of the thoughts and instincts that come up unbidden; and it seems to me, though not theologically accurate, to represent fairly enough the average mind of the Catholics with whom I have mixed in my lifetime. 'From my childhood,' the writer

says, 'I have been taught to believe in the infallibility of the Pope; and it was a puzzle to me why it should be under discussion now.' But whatever may be thought of the sentiments of others on this point, I think that there can be no hesitation about the mind of the Popes. In their dogmatic Letters—in their dealings with the Bishops, whether dispersed or in Council assembled, they make no secret of the fact that they consider themselves the appointed Guides and Teachers of the whole flock—people, Priests, and Bishops, whether in Council or out of Council. Consequently, we must not imagine that the morning after the definition the Holy Father will rise with the consciousness of any new mantle fallen from Heaven upon him, or any new tiara set upon his head."

So true is this, that, in Father Gallwey's judgment (p. 30), even apart from any definition of the Vatican Council, the dogma of Pontifical Infallibility "cannot be impugned without criminal rashness."

"In past history and in the living Church the Popes in their dealings with the Church, whether dispersed or assembled, without the slightest attempt at any concealment, assume that it is their place to teach the whole flock without any exception, and *to teach Œcumenical Councils what to define*, and afterwards revise and correct their definition if need be. On the other hand, Councils assembled, and Bishops in their scattered dioceses, so far from pronouncing anathemas on these assumptions of the Popes, seem never tired of reminding the Popes and reminding the Faithful that they also assume that the voice of Peter is the voice of Christ."

A final objection noticed by Father Gallwey is, that a definition of Pontifical Infallibility will work a "great change in the demeanour of the Pope towards the Church." Father Gallwey replies:—

"Supposing that the definition do strengthen the hands of the Vicar of Christ, and add boldness to his action, is it clear that this will be an evil? Is the world at present over-governed? Is it a gain to your children that pamphlets filled with poison should remain in their hands till a General Council shall assemble to anathematise them? Would morality be less pure, ceremonial less becoming, the example of clergy and laity less edifying in any Catholic land, if the influence of the Apostolic See could make itself more felt there. It is not by invoking Cæsar, it is not by deifying what is sometimes called the sovereign people, that the Christian Church is to be protected against despotism. Our safeguard is in true and sincere obedience, for such obedience constrains the providence of our God to watch lest harm come to us through the machinery which He Himself has created."

Father Gallwey concludes by alluding (p. 37) to the "failings real or imaginary," found "in the advocates of truth." It is evident of course, that nothing short of a miracle could secure impeccancy in orthodox believers.

Paris et les Pères du Vatican. Paris : Perisse.

THESE letters, written by one who warmly advocates the definition of Pontifical Infallibility, refer directly to the extraordinary burst of Gallicanism which has so unexpectedly appeared in Paris during the present year. They have the advantage of a most lively and attractive style ; and the Archbishop of Westminster, in an introductory letter, warmly and most justly congratulates the author on his "simple and popular" treatment of such "grave" questions. Nor is the reasoning less accurate because its exposition is popular.

On one question—which for ourselves we believe to be of far greater importance and difficulty than is sometimes supposed by Ultramontanes—we concur more heartily with the present writer than with some others who have written on the same side. We refer to the characteristics of an ex cathedrâ Act. "The Pope speaks ex cathedra," he says (p. 95), "whenever it is evident—whether by his express declaration or by *circumstances*—that he is addressing himself to the whole Church, in virtue of that supreme power of teaching which has been granted to Peter and his successors."

The following sentence is admirable, with which he concludes his whole argument:—

"Every supreme authority has necessarily the right of commanding, and still more the right of laying down the limits of his jurisdiction. . . . I ask you, then, who determines the sense of laws, except the lawgiver himself? If you doubt whether a monarch has really intended to enact a certain law to issue a certain absolute command, to whom would you apply in order to know his intention *except to himself?* Let the same course be pursued in regard to [what you think may be] ex cathedrâ Acts" (p. 95).

We observe, with much pleasure (p. 57), the very honourable mention of F. Knox's admirable treatise on Infallibility.

Ce qui se passe au Concile. Paris : Plon.

Letters from Rome on the Council. By QUIRINUS. London : Rivingtons.

THERE is a singular coincidence of tone and doctrine between these two volumes, both of which are written by persons who sincerely believe themselves Catholics in faith. This being so, their contents, to our mind, prove much more conclusively than can any Ultramontane argument, the absolute necessity of a definition on the Pope's authority in teaching.

The Vatican Council, and a Duty of Catholics in regard to it. A Sermon preached on Whit-Sunday, 1870. By GEORGE CASE, D.D., Canon of Clifton, and Missionary Rector of S. Peter's, Gloucester.

CANON CASE'S ecclesiastical position entirely prevents us from expressing freely our opinion on this publication. He considers (Preface that the Vatican Council cannot, as yet, "justify its claim to the title" of "Œcumenical"; although in its first dogmatic constitution it has expressly claimed that title. Moreover, Canon Case thinks (p. 11) that even if it *were* Œcumenical, a Catholic is at liberty to regard its definitions as not being infallibly true, "until they have been accepted by the Universal Church." If a Catholic priest can so express himself, it is of very urgent necessity certainly, that some definition on infallibility should be speedily put forth.

Joannis Baptistæ Franzelin e Societate Jesu, in Collegio Romano S. Theologiæ Professoris, Tractatus de Verbo Incarnato. Romæ et Taurini, apud Petrum Marietti. 1869.

THE publication of F. Franzelin's treatises goes on apace. We are glad to take the fact as a sign that the race of serious students is not yet extinct, nor the whole world given over, without hope of release, to all-devouring, nought-digesting superficiality.

We have already expressed (January, 1870, p. 239) our appreciation of F. Franzelin's genius and method. The general characteristics of the present volume are exactly similar to those we noticed in "de Deo Uno et Trino," and the writer's individuality is strikingly apparent throughout.

The extent and importance of the ground covered by the treatise "de Verbo Incarnato," embracing, as it does, theology proper and anthropology, is not unknown to our readers, who will find, in the work before us, the whole explored in the most scientific and orthodox spirit. In his opening thesis the author divides the treatise in such a way as to give the reader a bird's-eye view of the course to be traversed, and of the principal points of the route. "*Quamvis multiplex possit esse principium ordinis in distribuendis capitibus amplissimæ patentis doctrinæ de Incarnatione, hæc certe, quam adoptamus, tractationis distinctio* (in quatuor videlicet præcipua capita: de ipsa persona quæ manifestata est in carne; de natura deinde quam assumpsit; tum de formali ratione, qua natura eadem Verbo unita est; de munere denique Redemptoris, in quo Christus per ipsam Incarnationem est constitutus) *non potest negari esse apta inter cæteras tum ratione principii ordinis, quod constituitur in causis, quas dicunt intrinsecas, ipsius subjecti earumque simplicissima analysi; tum amplitudine doctrinæ, quam complectitur. Sub quatuor enim enuntiatis capitibus catholicum dogma,*

quis sit, quid sit, quomodo sit, ad quid sit Christus, declarandum sistitur in continenti oppositione ad quatuor errorum classes, ad quas fere revocantur hæreses circa christologiam hucusque exortæ, vel quæ oriri posse videntur."

As in "de Deo Trino," so here, the teaching of Gunther's school, condemned by the Holy See, is compared with the dogmatic teaching of the Church, and with the principles of sound philosophy, and is shown to be in opposition to both. The revelations made by our author on the state of theology in certain German circles, calling themselves Catholic, will probably astonish some of our readers. In *Thesis* xxiv. (sect. iii. cap. ii. p. 202, sqq.) there is a scathing exposure of one of Gunther's disciples. It would hardly be believed, if the fact were not beyond all doubt, that "a certain professor of theology" deliberately, and in print, appealed in support of his unsound teaching on the hypostatic union to a plainly Nestorian creed (the composition of Theodore of Mopsuestia) inserted in the first Act of the Council of Chalcedon, and condemned by that Council as well as by others. And another of the same hopeful school followed Dr. Baltzer (the illustrious professor's name ought not to be concealed), in order, we suppose, to keep that theologian in countenance, and lay the foundation of an extrinsic probability. We hear a good deal in England, from many Protestants, and from a handful of soi-disant Catholics, of German science, German erudition, German industry, thoroughness, and we know not what marvellous qualities besides. This incident is a curious commentary on a great deal of tall talk. It appears that Church history and the penny catechism, at all events, are not yet included within the "object" of German infallibility.

We should like to call the reader's special attention to the discussion on the real nature of *hypostasis*, and its application to the doctrine of the hypostatic union (sect. iii. cap. iii. thesis xxvi., sqq.). F. Franzelin takes the view which is, we believe, commonly called the Scotist. He shows very clearly, and at the same time in a manner easy to be understood, that the *suppositum* or *hypostasis* is not a modal entity superadded to the nature, already complete, but is simply the note of *totality*, by which a thing becomes perfect in itself and distinct from everything else. He also claims, and satisfactorily, as we think, S. Thomas for the same side.

In connection with the vicarious satisfaction of Christ, we commend to the reader the analysis of the greater part of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the fourth section (cap. ii. thes. xlviii. li.). The true interpretation and punctuation of Rom. ix. 5 (qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in sæcula) is also triumphantly vindicated against Wetstein's attempt to evade its force as a testimony to the divinity of Christ (sect. i. thes. ix.).

The present volume is uniform with those which preceded it. The paper and type are excellent. There are unfortunately too many, though happily not grave, typographical errors.

Conversations on Liberalism and the Church. By O. A. Brownson, LL.D. New York: 1870.

In an article on "Theological Errors of the Day," which appeared in our number for January, 1864, Dr. Brownson holds the place of central figure, as one in whose later writings a large proportion of those errors had been from time to time given to the world, accepted and endorsed by himself. Such of our readers as took the trouble of reading that article must have perceived that, while we did not spare the aberrations of the able and eloquent journalist, we, from first to last, drew a marked distinction between him and the mass of other tainted writers whom we there named or alluded to. We throughout desired to treat him with as much respect and tenderness as was compatible with an earnest effort to defend the cause of sacred truth. We ascribed his deviations from the old and royal path partly to an ill-regulated zeal for the conversion of non-Catholics, but principally to a new and too close and confiding familiarity with a set of scribes, immeasurably his own inferiors in every high and ennobling quality of head and heart. At the very outset of our strictures we stated, in the most explicit terms, our firm conviction of his subjective orthodoxy, and our entire acceptance of his repeated protestations to that effect.

Very soon after the appearance of that article, we learned that the celebrated "Quarterly Review," which had borne his name so many years, ceased exist. From that time we had not the pleasure of reading any production from his ready and vigorous pen. While our last number was issuing from the press we heard, and heard with unbounded delight, the double good news, that a new work of Dr. Brownson's on a most important subject had been published, and that it was altogether on the right side. We lost no time in procuring the volume; and, having got it into our hands, we read it through at once, swallowing it at a single gulp. The task was easy, for the volume is a small one; but had it been ten times as large the labour would not have been less a labour of love. In point of composition it is fully equal to any of his previous essays. In strong, clear, acute reasoning we cannot remember any one of them that we would put on a level with it. Then, sensitive as are our theological nerves, we did not meet, from beginning to end, a single objectionable sentence, or phrase, or word. There is, moreover, a total absence of those exaggerations and hasty judgments which used occasionally to offend the sense of thoughtful and dispassionate readers. In the following passage of his short preface Dr. Brownson strikes the key-note of the whole volume, and, no doubt of all his future writings:—"The doctrine is, I believe, rigidly orthodox. I have sought neither to offend the world nor to conciliate it. I do not believe in making concessions of what is not mine to concede. I have explained the teachings of the Church where they conflict with the spirit of the age; but I have not sought to conform them to that spirit. The Church was instituted by our Lord to govern the world according to the Divine Reason and Will, not to be governed by it." These words contain truths

of the deepest moment, and point out the one unerring principle of thought and action in all things, wherein the wisdom of this world and the wisdom of the Gospel, as interpreted by the Church, come into contact.

Both the book and the subject are too important not to demand a more lengthened and elaborate reviewal than we can now devote to them. This we reserve for a future occasion—probably our next issue. But we have felt it a duty not to let the present number pass through our hands without publishing the glad tidings we have just communicated to our readers. To give, however, some idea of Dr. Brownson's method and line of procedure, we may briefly say here that the work is chiefly made up of dialogue, carried on between an elderly Catholic clergyman and an American "able editor." The parties meet at a retired watering-place, and are thus introduced :—

"While at the spring .... I formed the acquaintance of several gentlemen, whose conversation interested me much. Among them were two who particularly attracted my attention. One, many years the elder, was apparently a minister or priest, with a quiet and unobtrusive manner, evidently a man of foreign birth and education, but speaking English as if it had been his native tongue. He must have been at least three score and ten ; but his form was erect and his eye undimmed, his natural strength unabated, and his voice unbroken, sweet, melodious, and sympathetic. He had for me a singular attraction, and I felt prepossessed in his favour at first sight. The other was an active, energetic man, under middle age, well made, with dark hair, heavy brows, and sharp, restless black eyes. His manner was not rude, but brisk and a little imperious, and he spoke always in a bold, confident tone, from which no appeal might be taken. He gave always his opinion promptly and unhesitatingly on any and every subject that came up, and seemed to have left no subject in law, politics, theology, literature, science, or art, on which he was not competent to pass a final judgment. It is hardly necessary to add, that he was the chief editor of a leading metropolitan journal.

"The two gentlemen were much together, and seemed to take no little interest in each other, although I could not discover that any topic was ever broached between them on which they did not disagree very essentially. Their conversation, or rather their discussion, attracted me as a listener, at first as drawing off my thoughts from myself, and afterwards by the interest it awakened in the subjects on which it chiefly turned, and I seldom failed to hear it. Other guests seemed as much attracted as myself, and whenever we saw them seated under the shade of the old maple-trees left standing near our hotel, we formed a ring round them, and sat and listened in silence.

"The editor was a man of our times, animated by the spirit of the age, and a firm believer in our glorious nineteenth century. 'The great objection, Father,' said he one day to the priest, as I soon learned he was, 'to the Church, is her unprogressive character. She fails to keep religion up with the times, refuses to advance with modern society, and the world goes on without her.'

" 'Whither?' quietly asked the priest.

" 'Whither? Why, on its progressive march.'

" 'Do you mean that the Church herself is not progressive, or that she opposes progress in individuals and society?'

" 'Both. The Church is stationary, remains what she was in the Dark Ages, does her best to keep society back where it was a thousand years ago, and to prevent the human race from taking a step forward.'

" 'There is, I suppose, no doubt of that?'

" 'Not the least."

" 'Is it not possible for the Church to remain immovable herself, and yet be very progressive in her influence on individuals and society generally?'

" 'To aid progress the Church must be herself progressive.'

" 'I have always thought differently.* Progress is motion; and if I have not forgotten what my professor of mechanics taught me, there is no motion possible without something at rest. Motion requires a mover, and the mover cannot move unless it is itself immovable. A man cannot make any progress if he stands on a movable foundation, as you may see in the case of the poor fellow in the treadmill. Archimedes, in order to move the world, demanded a whereon to rest the fulcrum of his lever outside of the world he proposed to move. The Church, if herself movable or progressive, could not aid either social or individual progress; she would simply change with the changes going on around her, and could neither aid nor control them.'

" 'But, Reverend Father, you overlook the fact that it is precisely in herself that progress is most needed. She teaches the same dogmas and claims the same authority over the mind, the heart, and the conscience in this enlightened age, and in this free republic, that she did in the barbarous ages under feudalism, and what she teaches and claims ceases to be in harmony with men's convictions, or their sense of their own rights and dignity.'

" 'The Church, then, you think, in order to be able to serve the world, should not govern it, but suffer herself to be governed by it, and take care to teach it only what it already believes and holds? This is a very good principle, no doubt, for a journalist, who seeks only a wide circulation for his journal, but do you think our Lord acted on it? Did He find the convictions of the world He came to redeem and save in harmony with His doctrines and claims? . . . . Did the Apostles teach only such doctrines and put forth only such claims as were in harmony with the sentiments and convictions of their age?' " &c., &c. (pp. 8–13).

This is, we think, quite enough to whet the appetite of our readers for the rich repast Dr. Brownson has provided for them.

And here, in taking leave for the present of our great old athlete of the faith, we heartily congratulate him on his perfect emancipation from the unworthy ties that fettered him for a time; and, though a mighty ocean rolls between us, we embrace him with all the fervour of that Catholic communion, which binds the children of the faith into one perfect and living body, as closely when half the sphere divides them as if they stood side by side, or knelt together at the same altar.

---

* Dr. Brownson here inserts a well-known anecdote of Dr. Johnson; but, quoting from memory, he gives it inaccurately. The following is Boswell's account (sub anno 1784):—"Johnson was present when a tragedy was read, in which there occurred this line:—

'Who rules o'er freemen should himself be free.'

The company having admired it much, 'I cannot agree with you,' said Johnson; it might as well be said,

'Who drives fat oxen should himself be fat.' "

Vie du R. P. Lacordaire. Par M. FOISSET. 2 volumes. Paris: Lecoffre. 1870.

Le Testament du P. Lacordaire, publié par le COMTE DE MONTALEMBERT. Paris: Douniol. 1870.

ALTHOUGH many books and *brochures* have been published on the life and character of the illustrious Dominican to whom religion in France owes so much, yet there was still room for the labours of M. Foisset. It was the wish of Lacordaire himself that his life should be written by the Abbé Perreyre, for whom he entertained the warmest friendship. But the death of Perreyre prevented the accomplishment of this desire, and at the same time deprived the French church of one of the most promising of her younger clergy. M. Foisset was, until lately, a magistrate of the Imperial Court of Dijon; and he has brought to his task the several qualifications of long and intimate personal acquaintance with the great Preacher, of the possession of abundant materials, of a practised and eloquent style, and of an impartial and most Catholic mind. Perhaps his most original contribution to the history of Lacordaire is his Introduction; in which he sketches the varying phases of the religious condition of France, from the time of Voltaire, to the moment when Lacordaire, once more a Catholic, entered the seminary of Issy. The peculiar union of bondage and sterility under which the Church of France laboured from the epoch of the Revolution in 1815 to the Revolution of 1830, though it has been noticed by various writers, has never been brought out better than by M. Foisset. There could not be a better prologue to the recital of Lacordaire's work, and a better key to the understanding of his peculiar character, than these pages of contrast between the new and abounding life that was feeling for outlet all over France, and the obsolete ideas of the *émigré* and absolutist party that was uppermost under Louis XVIII. and Charles X.

The history of Lacordaire's connection with La Mennais is given in these pages with a fulness that will seem to some readers tedious. But a historian of a man who has been so much traduced for Lamennaisian principles as the author of the French Dominican revival, may be excused for trying to make the proofs of Lacordaire's rectitude of intention and loyalty to the Holy See as complete and convincing as possible. The same remarks may be made of the details of the Father's political views and acts. It is quite necessary that the writer of his life should explain them and justify them. But the political side of a life like that of Lacordaire is just the side that will be forgotten the soonest, and that even now excites the least interest in all who are not of his own generation. To him politics were but a subordinate episode in that grand idea of human regeneration which he proclaimed to the world on behalf of the Church of Christ. His education had not given him fair means of studying the Church in her true political relation with the world; and his want of acquaintance with the history of the Middle Ages sometimes

allowed him, in his youth, to say imprudent things about abnormal states of society. And yet it would not be true to say that he erred as to the real nature of the connection of the State with the Church. Nothing can be more orthodox, as far as they go, than the three letters to Montalembert (given by M. Foisset, among his "Pièces Justificatives," vol. i. p. 559), in which he expresses his ideas on the Encyclical of August 15, 1832—the celebrated "Mirari vos."

What English readers will eagerly read in these two volumes is the recital of his oratorical triumphs, and of his religious work. They will seek the genius who gave a world-wide name to the Conferences of Notre Dame. They will seek the ardent and mortified follower of Jesus Christ, already known to them in the pages of Père Chocarne. They will be anxious to know more of the writer of these incomparable letters, so unaffected and yet so exquisitely finished, that are gradually being given to the world. They will be glad to follow once more, by the aid of new lights, the tale of the last years, and of the last days, at Soréze.

Lacordaire's "Testament" (the name given to it by Montalembert) is the short autobiography that he dictated upon his deathbed. As a document for understanding his life and character it is of course invaluable. To any English reader who has not yet made acquaintance with those last words of the great orator, we can say, that he will read many things before he meets with pages so noble, so powerful, so calm, and so lofty as this supreme effort of a great mind under the pressure of mortal sickness.

We hope to have an article on Lacordaire in October.

The Life of S. Teresa of Jesus. Written by herself. Translated from the Spanish by DAVID LEWIS. London: Burns, Oates, & Co. 1870.

IT has been said of S. Teresa, as it is often said of Plato, that she is much quoted and little read. The saying was probably intended to do her honour; and it has this much truth in it, that she is certainly much quoted. But this new translation of her autobiography is of itself sufficient argument to prove that she is also much read. It will surprise many readers to be told that there have been already four English versions of this celebrated work, and that the present is the fifth. Canon Dalton's translation is a well-known book, for which, and for his labours on the Saint's other works, the thanks of English-speaking Catholics have long been due. To supply the wants of a new generation Mr. Lewis has undertaken the task, on the completion of which we now congratulate him.

There is only one book that can be fitly compared with the Life of S. Teresa by herself. The *Confessions* of S. Augustine, in spite of differences of author and of matter which make them stand by themselves in literature, are yet sufficiently like these *Confessions* of S. Teresa not to be dishonoured by being placed beside them. S. Augustine, a bishop and a doctor, was a genius who had become a learned man before he became a saint. His

eloquence, which is of an intense but incomplete kind, like a fire that burns amid rolling smoke, is a reproduction of the man himself. He is a singular mixture of straightforward sense, of depth, of brilliancy, and of passion. His works are, on the one hand, the code in which the Church's doctors and the Church herself reads the authoritative exposition of a great part of her teaching; and, on the other, furnishes the favourite manuals from which saints of all ages have learned to pray. S. Teresa was a woman, and had no right, therefore, "to teach." In all that is called learning she was altogether ignorant. She did not know enough Latin to quote the Psalms of her office correctly. Yet her works, and not least her account of her Life, have a completeness of learning, a genuine eloquence, and a weight of authority such as we find in very few human writings. A reader who was unacquainted with S. Teresa, but who was fairly read in mystical theology, might take up her works for the first time with a sense that he had read their best parts already. In turning over the pages of the work before us, a great portion is not merely familiar, but almost commonplace. This is one great reason, no doubt, why it is so useful to get back frequently to S. Teresa. Her wonderful and inspired instruction on prayer, her hints on practical matters, and even the flights of her highest mysticism, are easily transferred to the pages of an ordinary spiritual manual. But the spirit, the context of holy humility and bashful knowledge, the outbursts of affection, that make her work the genuine production of a real living saint, these are matters that are quite as important; and it would seem, as far as human insight can tell, that it was for the sake of these that the Spirit of God caused her to write, and to write as she has written. It would seem to us, looking back now over the three hundred and eight years that have elapsed since, at the desire of her confessors, she wrote her Life, that she was raised up at a critical moment to be the apostle of true mysticism. S. Teresa wrote her works and lived the most important part of her life in the latter part of the sixteenth century. She founded the first monastery of her reform in 1562. In the same year she finished this book of her Life. She lived twenty years after that date, and died in 1582, after having founded sixteen convents of women and fourteen of men under the severe reform which she introduced. What the world was then will be recalled when we remember that the year 1563 saw the last session of the Council of Trent. During these twenty years that elapsed between the writing of this Autobiography and the saint's death, Philip II. reigned in Spain and Elizabeth in England. In France, it was the era of the religious wars, and the massacre of S. Bartholomew occurred in 1572. The Low Countries, the richest part of Europe, were fighting for their independence against the power of Spain. At the same time, Pius IV. and after him S. Pius V. were anxiously occupied with heresy at one extremity of Europe and with the Turks at the other. It was a time when both goodness and wickedness were showing themselves on a grander scale than had been seen since the Crusades. The Society of Jesus was just born, and some of its first and greatest saints were even then living. Spain and Italy were both prolific in sanctity and Catholic learning. S. John of the Cross, S. Louis Bertrand, S. Thomas of Villanova, S. Paschal Baylon, S. John of God, S. Peter of Alcantara, S. Francis Borgia, Luis of Granada, Bañes, John of Avila,

Balthasar Alvarez, Melchior Canus, Soto, are some of the names of S. Teresa's contemporaries, with most of whom she was herself acquainted. At a time when good and evil were struggling together in so marked a fashion, it was to be expected that mysticism, which is the heroic form of Christian prayer, would be also a field for contest and difficulty. False mysticism was very common in the innumerable convents which at that time flourished in the Catholic land of Spain. The sect of the *Alumbrados*, or *Illuminated*, arose about 1570, that is to say, eight years after S. Teresa had written her Life; and its manuscript pages were being circulated from convent to convent at the very time that the authorities of the Church were putting their powers into action against the sectaries who were renewing the dangerous teachings of the Gnostics and the Paulicians. Those who have read the Life of Luis of Granada by Muñoz will remember the story of the Prioress of the *Anunciada* at Lisbon. She deceived her nuns, her superiors, a great number of learned men, among whom was Luis of Granada himself, and her fame had gone abroad over all Spain and a great part of Europe. It is curious that it was the Venerable Mother Anne of S. Bartholomew, S. Teresa's most celebrated disciple and the inheritor of her spirit, who was one of the first to discredit the deception. The name of Sister Mary Magdalen of the Cross, of Cordova, recalls another history of illusion and fraud, worse than that first mentioned. Similar facts are met with in the lives of S. John of the Cross, S. Ignatius, and others. False mysticism did not disappear with the age of S. Teresa. About one hundred years after her death came the celebrated *Quietist* controversy, when the convents of France were troubled as the convents of the Peninsula had been in the preceding century. The errors that have sprung up under these various shapes have been met by the bishops and doctors of the Church, who have preached and written the true doctrine; but what we have to notice here is that ever since S. Teresa's writings have been before the world, they have been the chief authority and the text-book, so to speak, of Mystical Theology. We need only cite, in order to prove this, three such books as the "Amour de Dieu," of S. Francis of Sales; the "Direttorio Mistico" of Scaramelli; and the "Institutiones Theologiæ Mysticæ" of Schram. S. Francis, in his preface to a treatise which has done more perhaps than any other work of modern times to introduce the higher form of spirituality into the world (as distinct from the cloister), seizes on the three characteristics of S. Teresa's writings, their eloquence, their strong simplicity (and simplicity meant a great deal to S. Francis of Sales), and their thoroughness of learning, or rather of knowledge. Scaramelli, living after the Church had declared the holy virgin to be a saint, uses her example as the great and peremptory proof, that Mystical Theology may profitably be imparted to all classes of the faithful. Schram, like Cardinal Bona and Scaramelli himself, finds in the words of S. Teresa one of his readiest and most authoritative resources, as may be seen on every page of his Manual of Mysticism. Not even S. John of the Cross is quoted by mystical writers as S. Teresa is. The former, wonderful and magnificent as he is, speaks less "as one having authority" than does the glory of Mount Carmel.

It is not the place here to speak in detail of the peculiar value of this life of S. Teresa, as a contribution to mystical science. Besides the instructions

that are everywhere scattered through its forty chapters, there is a distinct and orderly treatise on Prayer and its higher states, contained in the chapters that occur between the ninth and the twenty-third—a treatise of which every paragraph is classical. Readers will naturally go to the work, if they go at all, chiefly for the purpose of studying the science of Prayer. But they will meet with many other things by the way. This life seems to have an especial gift of infusing courage into the hearts of those who are trying to lead a life of perfection. It is not that S. Teresa makes too light of the difficulties of such an attempt. She knew well enough what it means, and she says that the world is so hard upon beginners, that "it requires greater courage in one not yet perfect to walk in the way of perfection than to undergo an instant martyrdom" (p. 260). Still, the account of her own childhood and early religious life, of her levity and shortcomings until she was well advanced in years, is encouraging to those who are but too conscious of much of the same thing in themselves. They seem to see that Teresa was a woman after all, and that the Holy Ghost made her a Saint. It is this view which furnishes the refrain of all her experiences, and it is a view that does the ordinary devout Christian more good than many sermons on asceticism. It may be true that the Saint gives us an exaggerated account of her youthful failings, and that Teresa at her worst was better than most of us at our best. Still, the impression of God's condescension and limitless power and love remains upon the mind, and souls learn to regard perfection as not out of their reach. "Let them not distress themselves; let them trust in our Lord" (p. 261). Another general impression that is left by the words of the Saint is, that of the necessity of advice. Perhaps we should rather say, the necessity of conferring with others. It may seem a paradox to say that those who are striving after perfection feel a difficulty in speaking to others concerning the state of their souls. Devout people, it may be thought, are generally too fond, perhaps, of imparting their experiences and requesting advice. But it must be remembered that among devout people the number of those seriously and (so to speak) scientifically aiming at perfection is not by any means large, and that there are people in this number whose naturally difficult natures may prevent them for a long time from being classed among the (externally) devout. S. Teresa, indeed, seems almost to make light of the necessity of a director for people who have no desire to live more than an ordinary life, though she advises beginners to talk on spiritual matters with those who are like-minded with themselves. But when the soul has entered and made some progress in the way of perfection, then enlightened guidance is absolutely necessary.

And her allusions to confessors and learned men are both touching and startling; touching, from the affectionate anxiety with which she often declares that she prays for them and trusts in them; startling, from the demands she makes on those who have anything to do with advanced souls. One of the most thrilling passages of the Life, is that which describes her meeting with S. Peter of Alcantara. "I saw almost at once that he understood me, by reason of his *experience*. . . . To a person whom our Lord has raised to this state, there is no pleasure or comfort equal to that of meeting with another whom our Lord has begun to raise in the same way" (p. 241). Her delight

on finding a really efficient master in the spiritual life sometimes rises to enthusiasm. "What a grand thing it is," she exclaims, "to understand a soul!" (p. 186).

It is not to be expected that a Saint will spend much time in speaking of her own personal appearance or natural character, however much a little knowledge on both these subjects would please and edify her readers. It is from other sources, therefore, that we learn that she had a pleasant face, rather inclining to fulness; that her hair was black; and that a pair of black and keen eyes communicated to her, in common life, sometimes an air of shrewdness, not without a suggestion of sarcasm; at other times, a wonderful and commanding attraction. But of her natural character she does give us one or two traits in the Life. She owns that she has the gift of courage. "They say of me that my courage is not slight, and it is known that God has given me a courage beyond that of a woman; but I have made a bad use of it" (p. 56). Grace in S. Teresa's soul is so powerful and beautiful that speculations as to her natural gifts are of little interest. But when grace made her a reformer, a founder, and a ruler of women and of men, one cannot help suspecting that she would have been one of the "strong women" of the world, for good or for evil, whether she had been a Saint or not. The child who wanted to run away to the Moors for martyrdom, was none the less fit to defy the devil, in after life, with characteristic scorn, and to go on from one foundation to another, and from one height of prayer to another, amid all the difficulties of doubting directors, of troublesome authorities, and of what we cannot properly take into account now—the jealous scrutiny of that Tribunal whose power was as great as its means of information were ample. Another piece of knowledge that she gives us about herself is, that she had "no imagination." She repeats this over and over again, and attributes to this want of imagination her inability to make what is strictly called "meditation." It must be admitted that it is difficult to believe a S. Teresa when she laments her defective imagination. In all the highest operations in which the imagination is the handmaid of the intellect, in vivid mental portraiture, in subtle combination, in telling illustration, what she does contradicts what she says. The explanation seems to be, that the imagination, in ordinary people, has to form its pictures of things by the slow process of adding line to line and tint to tint; and this is what people do who *meditate;* but the more powerful the imagination, the more rapidly does it combine, and in some men it combines so rapidly that it seems to combine wholesale, or, in other words, to produce the picture rather by a single act than by a process of acts. This seems to have been S. Teresa's case. She could not meditate any more than a bird can walk, because she had a more rapid way of realizing the object presented to her. But that she had the power of the imagination in its highest sense, is evident. In early life, as was natural, it required to be stimulated in order to represent God and divine things, because grace had not yet conquered it; and this explains the Saint's delight in spiritual books (during prayer), in images, in the fields, the trees, and the flowers, and it throws much light on her characteristic devotion to the sacred humanity of our Lord. "I used to labour with all my might to imagine Jesus Christ, our God and our Lord, *within me.* And

this was the way I prayed" (p. 20). This was at the very beginning of her religious life. And during the twenty years or so that she practised mental prayer, with greater or less fervour, before the epoch when her supernatural visitations began, when she met with a director, and gave herself more completely to God—during these twenty years, when most religious would have been assiduously going from point to point in manuals of meditation, she never "meditated" at all. And she expresses her conviction that it was through God's goodness that she found no director during that time, for he would have tried to make her "meditate," which was an impossibility to her. The study of this her method of prayer, and, indeed, of a multitude of other matters that we have no space to touch upon, makes this undying work ever attractive to those who are interested in the divine science its author has done so much to illustrate.

In estimating the value of Mr. Lewis's translation, it is very necessary to bear in mind the difficulty of his task. S. Teresa, as all know who have the slightest acquaintance with her Spanish, is a difficult author. She seems to have no style, in the modern sense of the word. She puts things down, and heaps up phrase upon phrase full of weight and sometimes of brilliancy; but literary form is almost entirely wanting. And this cannot be ascribed altogether to the age in which she lived. If we turn to Luis of Granada, her contemporary, we find smoothness and cadence in great perfection. The explanation is, that Luis of Granada was an educated man, a professional writer and speaker, who had formed his style upon the best models of antiquity; whilst S. Teresa was totally devoid of literary culture, and merely wrote because she had something to say. The best way to give an English reader an idea of her style will be to take an example from a writer who has, perhaps, seldom been mentioned beside her. Bacon came of age in the same year that S. Teresa died. English prose at that time, even in the hands of its greatest masters, was rude and ill-fashioned, though it was full of great thoughts and happy words. Here are two sentences from an essay of Bacon, "On Innovation."

"Surely every medicine is an innovation, and he that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils, for time is the greatest innovator; and if time, of course, alters all things for the worst, and wisdom and council shall not alter them for the better, what shall be the end? It is true that what is settled by custom, though it be not good, yet at least it is fit; and those things which have long gone together are, as it were, confederate within themselves, whereas new things piece not so well, but though they help by their utility, yet they trouble by their inconformity; besides, they are like strangers, more admired and less favoured."

It is into prose something like this that S. Teresa's Spanish would naturally run. But this style of translation is out of the question. The translator, therefore, has not only to attend to word and to phrase, but he has to alter the whole mould of the composition; and there is no task which the anxiety to steer a middle course between strict fidelity and perfect ease renders more troublesome and trying. There is no doubt that the version of Mr. Lewis reads, on the whole, a little stiff; but we are inclined to think that this could not have been avoided without sacrificing S. Teresa's own spirit more than any reader would have liked. But the translation, as far as we have

tested it, is faithful and exact, and it is often happy. A few renderings here and there, no doubt, might be questioned ; and there are one or two quasi-technical terms, such as *imaginario*, *impetu*, that might, perhaps, have been sometimes differently given. The expression, "an imaginary vision" (see pp. 209—221), would convey a wrong idea to many readers, who would take "imaginary" to be opposed to "real," whereas it is opposed to "intellectual.' But, except to discharge our duty as critics, we have no desire to dwell upon the few defects in an excellent and valuable piece of work such as Mr. Lewis has here given us. In addition to its merit as a new and independent translation, it should be mentioned that it is translated from the latest Spanish edition of the Saint's works, that of Don Vincente de la Fuente (Madrid, 1861, 1862), from which edition the translator has also taken the newly-arranged and increased collection of "Relaciones," with which he has enriched the volume before us. The introduction, notes, and other critical apparatus show the fruits of wide reading, and render the work complete on the heads of editing and scholarship.

Disputationes Theologicæ de Justitia et Jure, ad normam juris municipalis Britannici et Hibernici conformatæ. Auctore GEORGIO CROLLY, in Collegio S. Patricii apud Maynooth, in Hibernia, S. Theologiæ Dogmaticæ et Moralis Professore. 1870.

WE understand that Professor Crolly is either at press, or immediately going to press, with the second part of this most able and important work ; which part is to treat *de Contractibus et de Restitutione*, and is expected to appear at the close of the present or early in the next year. We therefore reserve our detailed reviewal of the work until its completion. Meantime we would observe briefly that this is the first time an attempt has been made to introduce into a scientific theological treatise a digest of the municipal laws of these countries, similar to those which have been executed by other eminent theologians for other countries : by Molina, for example, for Spain as it stood nearly three centuries ago ; by Carrière for France in our own day. For the perfection of such a digest two conditions are essential—completeness and accuracy ; and in the attainment of both Mr. Crolly has been eminently successful. The evidences of completeness lie open on every page. As to accuracy, putting aside the author's well-known relish for the subject, and his long and close study of it, enough to say that each sheet, as it passed through the press, was read carefully by a professional lawyer of long and high standing at the Irish bar. The want of such a work has been long and keenly felt ; and every theological student should feel deeply grateful to the learned and accomplished Maynooth Professor, for the immense labour of reading and thought which he must have gone through in supplying that want and supplying it so well. Of the public appreciation of this labour no light proof has been given, in the large and steady sale of the volume, from the day of its publication down to that of the present writing.

The Directorium Asceticum; or, Guide to the Spiritual Life. By JOHN BAPTIST SCARAMELLI, S.J. Translated and edited at S. Beuno's College, North Wales. In four volumes. Vol. II. Dublin: Kelly; London: Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.; Burns & Oates. 1870.

THIS second volume of the S. Beuno's translation of F. Scaramelli's Ascetical Directory treats of the hindrances that arise in the path of Christian Perfection from the Senses and the Passions of human nature, from Temptations and from Scruples. On looking it through, we are once more struck with the difference in value of the matter that makes it up. On the one hand it is difficult to overpraise the acute analyses, the discreetness, and completeness of advice, and the genuine and traditional Catholic spirit of which it is full. On the other hand, much of the lighter part of the volume—that which the old Jesuit Father intended to be the padding of his solid reflections—is sadly distracting to a generation so devoid of simplicity as ours. The exploits of the monks who figure in the pages of Cassian are not deficient in the grotesque; but they have an air of authenticity about them, and they have spoken to the heart of the Cloister ever since S. Benedict recommended them to his first disciples. But the materials of the *Vitæ Patrum* are by no means all as worthy of reproduction as the stories of Cassian; and, though our old acquaintance, Cesarius of Heisterbach, does not appear so frequently in the present volume, his place is not inadequately supplied by one or two others. We must not be understood to complain of the translators in this matter; we are glad to have Scaramelli whole and entire. He is sufficiently a classic to stand, without being entrusted to other people's taste to be made presentable. At the same time it is well to warn the readers of this excellent translation, that some prudence must be used in reproducing such things, as the downright speeches of S. Jerome, and the stories in which the devils so largely figure. But nothing can be more satisfactory than the way in which the author continually confirms and illustrates his teaching by the words of the holy Fathers. In Asceticism anything like narrowness and sentimentality is fatal; and there is nothing that keeps principle true and practice large, like a constant recourse to the words of those from whom the Church of all times has sought guidance. No doubt, the work of F. Scaramelli might have drawn more largely from another source—we mean, from the words and deeds of the modern saints. Perhaps many readers will be sorry he has not given more of the light of times that are nearer our own. Meanwhile, we may be thankful for what we have.

There can be no greater boon to those who are beginning the exercise of the Apostolic ministry, than the plain, precise, and wise rules laid down by F. Scaramelli on Asceticism in all its branches—on the practice of mortification, on the best methods of subduing the passions, and on the ways of meeting temptation. System in spiritual matters seems to many people, if not a mistake, at least a danger. To grow in goodness by rule is impossible; therefore rules, they think, are apt to encourage formalism. If rules of

asceticism were the only instructions given to a soul, doubtless the affective acts of the will, in which Perfection consists, would languish into formalism. But the work of the spiritual life is a complex work, in which the head must be instructed whilst the heart is warmed. A treatise like the volume before us is not the first and the last word of spiritual progress; but, in its place, it is none the less essential.

The editors have added to this volume a series of skeleton-sermons, founded on the work. They are a kind of index in another shape, but they offer the additional advantage of Introductions and Perorations. They will, no doubt, be useful to those who can use skeleton-sermons. They are distributed among the various Sundays and principal festivals of the year. Sometimes a little ingenuity seems to have been required to fit some of the days with a subject. "Confession" is an important matter, but of all days it would seem to be least appropriate for Easter Sunday. On the day of Pentecost, too, a preacher would surely have exhausted a great many subjects before he gave his hearers an instruction on "Scruples"; and S. John Baptist, though a chief pattern of mortification, seems to be hardly treated in having assigned to his day a sermon on the "Sense of Smell."

Of the manner in which the translation is executed we have nothing to add to the expression of our satisfaction in April. It is as good a translation as any we ever saw; and, knowing what many translations of spiritual books are, it is a pleasure to think that such a standard work is being introduced to English readers in so admirable a dress. Four valuable *Indices* to vols. I. and II. complete the present volume.

Sermons by Fathers of the Society of Jesus. Vol. I. Burns, Oates, & Co. 1870.

WE must repeat what we said when the first part of this volume was published separately. "In no particular perhaps is English Catholic literature so deficient as in published sermons, and we are particularly glad therefore that the Jesuit Fathers are projecting a continuous publication of the kind. They could not have begun more auspiciously."

The volume before us contains, first—Father Coleridge's four sermons on "the Latter Days," of the special value of which we spoke at length on that occasion, in our July number of last year. Next, four sermons by Father Hathaway on the Temptations of our Lord; then, five by Father Gallwey, on the Remedies against Desolation; and, lastly, seven on the "Mysteries of the Holy Infancy;" the four first of this latter part being by Father Parkinson, the fifth on the Epiphany by Father Coleridge, and the two last by Father Harper.

There is no one of these sermons which is not well worth careful study, because there is none which is not the result of much thought. This is the characteristic by which we have been chiefly struck throughout the

volume, and it is no small praise, especially in our own day, when those who are called to preach are required to do so almost incessantly, and when therefore it is difficult even for men deeply impressed with the seriousness and responsibility of the office of speaking in the name of God to His people, are hardly able to give the time necessary for thinking before they speak or write.

It is one special object of preaching in church, by which it is strongly divided from the act of addressing unbelievers which bears the same name, that the preacher specially desires to supply food for meditation, and to direct its course. Without meditation the soul of a Christian is starved, and meditation is to most men so difficult and is so much less practised than it ought to be as an art to be attained by diligent exercise, that it is no small thing if a preacher is able to assist even one of his congregation in acquiring it. And this is the especial value of sermons which (like those of Father Harper and F. Parkinson in the volume before us) exhibit in detail some act of the earthly life of our Blessed Lord, which is the great mine from which meditation works the precious ore. The sermons on the Temptation of our Blessed Lord seem to us specially useful in this respect. Thus F. Hathaway describes the "scene of the temptation."

"I see no reason for rejecting the more common opinion which places the scene in that desolate region that stretches between Jericho and Bethel, not far from the Jordan; or for doubting the truth of the local tradition, attested by the earliest travellers in Palestine, which has for so many centuries pointed out particular caves there as spots hallowed by the presence of our Lord during the forty days. This desert bears the name of Quarantana from the number of days. It would naturally be spoken of as 'the desert,' to any one coming, as our Lord did, from the Jordan. It is described as a remarkably dreary and cheerless solitude, with great masses of rock rising out of barren sand, a high mountain towering in the midst of all. S. Matthew, in speaking of our Lord's leaving the Jordan, uses a word which would literally be rendered 'wasted up,' an expression which could not properly be applied to the great desert which was both to the south and on a lower level. Elias had dwelt in this desert near the Jordan also; and Eliseus, in mystical anticipation of our Lord, had changed bitter waters in it into sweet. Hither then our Saviour was led by a direct and vehement impulse of the Holy Spirit, to which HE rendered prompt and willing obedience. He remained here alone, without eating or drinking, surrounded by wild beasts and evil spirits, and apparently exposed during the whole time to their assaults, although three temptations only which HE encountered at the end of the forty days are recorded as specimens for our instruction" (p. 97).

We think no one acquainted with the "spiritual exercises" will fail to see how strikingly this passage assists him who desires to meditate upon the temptation of our Lord in forming the "*compositio loci*" required by S. Ignatius.

We take another extract from the same sermon on the "Reality and Circumstances of our Lord's Temptatations":—

"Let us excite ourselves to a lively gratitude for the consolation and instruction that our Blessed Lord gives us, and the graces that He earned for us in this mystery of His temptation, by thinking of what it cost Him.

Whenever He goes before us, it is always with bleeding feet. Let us try to picture to ourselves our Divine Master in that savage desert. He has all our human feelings, though He is God blessed for ever. The sun's rays beat violently on His head by day, and the heat reflected from the rocks around and the sand beneath scorches Him like a furnace; the rough blasts from the mountain, the heavy dews, and the damp drip of the cave, chill Him through the night; He is wasted by hunger, parched by thirst, sleepless and exhausted; wild beasts roar around Him; evil spirits in a thousand hideous forms afflict His sight. These things we can faintly imagine; but oh, you that think you love Him, what seems to you the degradation to the All-Holy One of the presence and touch of the prince of darkness, and the torture to the Sacred Heart of instigations to sin? To mere men who were supernaturally enlightened with some sense of the majesty of God and the malice of rebellion against Him, an evil thought has been worse than the rack. S. Stanislaus fainted away at a foul word; S. Francis Regis, when a child, was made seriously ill by the description of a mortal sin; S. Francis Xavier, even in sleep, was in such agony at the suggestion of evil, that blood gushed from him. What was it to the Infinitely Holy to be beset and compassed by temptation; to be spoken to, and touched, and carried hither and thither by the personification of all evil? God Incarnate in the hands of Satan! Let us try to rouse our dull minds to some warmth of gratitude for light and strength purchased for us at such a price, and to some strenuous determination to fight by that light and with that strength" (p. 103).

These extracts will show our meaning when we say that F. Harper's sermons on the different scenes of the life of our Blessed Lord seem specially intended and adapted to be an aid to meditation.

We had intended to enter in some detail on F. Gallwey's sermons on Desolation. But we have already passed the space allowed us. We will therefore only say that their object, equally important and equally clearly defined, is to assist the hearer and the reader to distinguish for himself the temptations with which Satan especially besets those who are in earnest striving to serve God. It would seem almost presumptuous to say of a director whose experience in that particular line has for so many years been so specially great, that F. Gallwey most forcibly and practically enters into the detail of that particular branch of these temptations to the unfolding of which these sermons are specially devoted.

The Attributes of Christ; or, Christ, the Wonderful, the Counsellor, God the Mighty, the Father of the World to come, the Prince of Peace. By Father Joseph Gasparini, of the Order of the Passionists. Duffy: Dublin and London. 1870.

THERE is something in the whole tone of this book which reminds one of what are called the "middle ages." There may be readers even of the Dublin to whom this may seem to convey more or less blame;

here will assuredly be many to whom it will seem high commendation. For good or evil, however, such is the case. The special characteristic of those ages was, that the Incarnation of the Eternal Word, His life on earth, His works and words, and, above all, His Passion and Death, were regarded universally—that is, by worldly and irreligious as well as by religious and devout persons—as the one key to all the mysteries and all the puzzles of the world and of human life. No one who knows anything of history can shut his eyes to the crimes and outrages by which they were stained. They were days of violence. The world was governed by the strong hand. For the weak and defenceless, they were, on the whole, times dangerous, to say the least: and as the weak and defenceless classes comprise at all times so large a proportion of the human family, this was a most serious evil. All the world knows, for instance, how in 1228 S. Elizabeth, widow of the Sovereign Duke of Thuringia, and daughter of the King of Hungary, as soon as the tidings arrived that her husband, the Duke, was dead on the crusade, was turned out of doors from his castle at Wartbourg, with her infant children, by his brothers Henry and Conrad. "The daughter of a king walked down the steep sorrowful and weeping, in her arms her new-born infant, and followed by the three others. It was mid-winter, and the cold intense;* and when she reached the town which lay beneath the castle, no one dared to give her shelter, fearing the anger of the Landgraves, her brothers-in-law, who had threatened with severe punishment all who should receive her. Such a thing, thank God, would be impossible in our days. Neither can we imagine a prince, who, because he took umbrage at an official act of a great prelate, should "break in upon him when sitting in full chapter," as the same Conrad did† upon the Archbishop of Mayence at Erfurt, "seize him by the hair, throw him to the ground, and proceed to stab him," and who, when this had been with difficulty prevented by the interference of his followers, should ravage the lands of the Archbishop, among other acts of violence burning a town "with all its churches and convents, and a large part of its inhabitants." Men of peace can hardly be sorry not to live in such times as those. But, then, the after history of the same Conrad would be quite as strange in our days. A woman of abandoned life came to beg of him at his castle near Gotha. The Landgrave reproached her with the infamy of her life, and she declared with tears that she had been driven to it by utter destitution. The whole of the next night he spent in an agony of remorse, thinking how much more guilty he himself was in the sight of God than the wretched woman he had upbraided, because he was rich and powerful, and had received and grievously abused so many gifts of God. The next day he declared his change of mind to his followers, and immediately set out barefoot on pilgrimage, first to the shrine of Gladenbach, in the immediate neighbourhood, and afterwards to Rome. Thence he returned to Fritzlar (the town he had burned); he found those of the inhabitants who had escaped the conflagration sheltering themselves in the ruins of the

* Montalembert, Vie de Sainte Eliz., vol. ii.
† *Id.*, page 243.

principal monastery, and immediately prostrated himself before them, begging their pardon for the injury he had done them. Then he walked barefoot to the door of the Church (which had been rebuilt), and kneeling down there, threw off his garment and offered to the crowd a discipline inviting them to punish him. "The offer was accepted by an old woman, who inflicted on him many stripes, which he accepted patiently." He then entered a religious order, devoting a great part of his wealth to build a church dedicated to his sainted sister-in-law, which still exists although desecrated three centuries ago, and at last died in the odour of sanctity.

Times when these things could happen seem so unlike our own that most of us are tempted to exaggerate either their bright or their dark features. Perhaps the ultimate result of actual temptation and difficulty to individuals may differ less in amount than we are apt to suppose, from those we have to encounter in our own time, but, be this as it may, the difference in kind must be enormous. A Catholic in our day can hardly fancy what it must have been to live in times when the great truths of the Catholic faith were first principles to all men, good and bad alike, the difference between them being only that one did and the other did not act on his belief. For it is only by a considerable and continued effort that any man can keep before him as his own first principles of action, truths, however certain, which half the people whom he meets, whether in society or on business, speculatively deny, and which the other half, while professing to admit them, treat as opinions which have no connexion with daily life and to which it would be bad taste to refer except in church on Sunday. Five or even four hundred years ago they were felt even by men openly wicked and violent (like the Landgrave Conrad before his change of life), to be the most strictly practical of all truths. Men like him were perfectly conscious that they were in open rebellion against the divine authority visibly manifested on earth. That it was so manifested they never thought of doubting. By this no doubt their guilt was greatly increased; as, on the other hand, it was perhaps as greatly diminished by the greatness of the temptation to crimes of violence thrown in their way by the manners and circumstances of their times. In our times temptation to such crimes, as far at least as relates to the educated classes, no longer exist, but we are placed in circumstances in which we are always tempted to forget, and at the best can hardly help regarding as unpractical, truths which to them were the most certain and most practical of all others.

Whether by this change we have gained most or lost most may be an open question: what cannot be doubted is the absolute necessity for every man in our day who wishes to be a Christian, of resisting especially its predominant temptation, and learning to regard life, as in the middle ages it was regarded by all men, as a riddle, the only key to which is furnished by the great facts of the Incarnation, the Life, the Passion, the Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of the Eternal Son. That if these things are true at all, they must give a new colour to every event and every relation of human life, reason cannot help admitting. But what reason admits becomes a practical truth only to those who live in the habit of meditation.

And as a guide to such meditation no works are more important than those which, like the volume before us, are written in the spirit of the ages when the habit of mind, now so hard to form and develop, was in one form or another common to all men. The author tells us that his object has been—

"To combine instruction with the subject of meditation, or at least to provide such a groundwork for consideration as to help the Christian to soar to the contemplation of the characteristics of the Saviour, as understood through the language of the prophet, and the chief point was to keep a middle course between the abstruse reasoning of theology and the enraptured vision of the truly contemplative soul; leaving the latter full scope to extend her view, and penetrate, as far as may be permitted, into the regions of inspiration" (p. vii.).

With this view the author takes in turn each of the attributes of our Divine Redeemer set forth in the glorious prophecy contained in the sixth verse of the ninth chapter of the Prophet Isaias. The very fact of seeing our Incarnate Saviour, not merely in the Gospels, but in the Old Testament, is one instance of that spirit of which we have already been speaking. The author accordingly shows first how He is "the Wonderful" in His Incarnation, in our Redemption, in His hidden life, in the Holy Eucharist; how He is the Councellor; how He is God Omniscient Omnipresent, Eternal, Wisdom, Beatitude, Mercy, Justice, Might. Under this last head he passes to the might of the sufferings of the Eternal Son, which are treated in twelve chapters. Then follow three on the title, "Father of the World to come," and finally four on that of "Prince of Peace."

The work is evidently the result of silent meditation on each of these points; it is full of thought, and we are sure cannot be carefully read by any man without suggesting to him many thoughts beyond those which it explicitly developes. In one respect it seems to us to differ from all works of meditation with which we are acquainted; we mean in the abundance with which the thoughts of ancient writers are wrought into the substance of every meditation. It is impossible not to be struck with this in opening almost any single page of the volume. In the page, for instance, in which the author treats of the treachery of Judas, we find quotations from S. Austin on S. Matthew; S. John Chrysostom and S. Austin on S. John; S. Cyprian on the Cœna Domini; S. Leo's sermon on the Passion; and Venerable S. Bede on the Acts. The same spirit runs through the volume.

From the extract which we have given above every attentive reader will have seen that the volume is not a translation from an Italian work, but written in English by a foreigner. Regarded as such it is a wonderful proof of his mastery over our language. Still there is hardly a page in which a person accustomed to compare styles will not be reminded that he is not reading the work of an Englishman. We are far from sure, however, that to educated readers this will be even a drawback upon the value of the volume. Uneducated ones might probably find it difficult. But what degree of difficulty there is is not more than enough to produce that slight sense of something strange and unaccustomed which makes it

a pleasure to read a work in a foreign language. It is not so much that particular words are used in a manner which the English grammar does not admit (this we have met in comparatively few instances), as that the mould of sentences and the order of thoughts are more or less unusual. On the whole, we have to thank F. Gasparini for a very valuable addition to our devotional books.

A Few Thoughts on the Infallibility of the Pope. By WALTER SWEETMAN, B.A. London: Longmans.

MR. SWEETMAN writes against the Pope's Infallibility in a tone of perfect temperance and moderation; but he has adduced no arguments on his side which have the slightest pretension to novelty. We should not therefore have thought it worth while to notice his pamphlet except for his very singular misapprehension of what has been said in this REVIEW.

He considers (p. 10) that the DUBLIN REVIEW "is probably the ablest organ of the extreme views it advocates," and that its Editor (p. 9) is "a very able and learned man." It is the more important, therefore, to rectify his singular mistakes as to what we have said. We never alleged (p. 9.) that Catholics "are obliged to obey, under pain of mortal sin, a variety of" Pontifical "utterances" which are not ex cathedrâ. Still less did we ever dream of thinking that "if Catholics were to get the upper hand in the United Kingdom, it would be their duty to gag the Protestant press and to annihilate the Anglican Bishops" (p. 11). Still more heartily do we repudiate all sympathy with the notion, that "if such men as Mr. Ffoulkes or Mr. Husband are not necessarily to be burned in Smithfield, it is because life is so much pleasanter now than in the fourteenth century that *hanging would be bad enough for them*" (*ib.*). As Mr. Sweetman reads our pages so diligently, we wish he would read them more accurately.

Defence of the Roman Church against Father Gratry. By the Right Rev. DOM PROSPER GUERANGER, O.S.B. With an Introduction by Very Rev. R. B. Vaughan, O.S.B. London: Washbourne.

FATHER WOODS has done excellent service in translating Dom Gueranger's most admirable and conclusive treatise. We noticed it in our last number; here therefore we will comment on it no further than by drawing attention to the very emphatic manner in which (p. 29) he characterizes the Bull "Unigenitus" as indubitably ex cathedrâ. That Bull censures no one proposition as actually *heterical*, and cannot therefore

in the strictest sense be called a definition of Faith. We have here, therefore, another proof how little Dom Gueranger's accidental language, to which we refer in our article on "the Council," can be taken as expressing his real mind.

Prior Vaughan's introduction is masterly. We would only draw attention to his mode of expression from p. 11 to p. 13. He may be understood in those pages as maintaining that there is a parity between Arians of the fourth century, before their condemnation, and those at the present moment, who deny Pontifical Infallibility. But surely Arians were formal heretics from the very first.

The Life of S. Stanislas Kotska, of the Company of Jesus. London: Burns, Oates, & Co. 1870.

THE life of S. Stanislas Kotska, of the Company of Jesus, which has just appeared in the Library of Religious Biography, edited by Mr. Healy Thompson, is an admirable companion volume to the "Life of S. Aloysius Gonzaga," with which the series commenced, and which, we are happy to see, has already reached a second edition. These two saints resemble each other in their early sanctity, their vocation to the Company of Jesus, the seemingly insuperable obstacles which they had to overcome in carrying it into effect, and the shortness of their life in religion; but they differ in the types of sanctity which they respectively express.

"They are sweet varieties in the Paradise of God, where, as in the garden of nature, no two flowers, although one in species, are altogether alike in their individuality. Both saints have been given as patterns to the young; but, while Aloysius carries us on to the verge when adolescence begins to melt into manhood, Stanislas, who passed to heaven at eighteen, bore to the last the type of childhood, with all its freshness and peculiar graces, which, like to the morning air, possess an inexplicable sweetness, destined to die away with the advancing hours. Aloysius scarcely seemed to pass through childhood's season; he comes before us as a youth while yet a boy, and he is still a youth when he dies, although a man in years; but Stanislas, although he outstepped the age of boyhood, bears, in our eyes, to the last the soft down of childhood on his cheek, and its innocent joyous smile upon his lips. This childlike character was also stamped on his devotion, sublime as it was. Hence the ineffable familiarities and mutual caresses of the infant Jesus and the boy saint; and again the loving confidence between the Virgin Mother and this her favoured child. Stanislas's devotion to Mary is indeed the perfect counterpart, only in a superior order, of that pure and engrossing passion of the young boy's heart, whose earthly mother sums up to him all of love andloveliness which this world can offer" (pp. 3, 4).

A saint whose characteristic grace was childlike simplicity, and whose special devotion had for its object the Infant Jesus and His Virgin Mother, needs only to be known in order to attract to him many hearts, not only among religious, but among those whose calling is in the world.

Mr. Thompson's work will, we are sure, help to increase the number of S. Stanislas's clients in this country. It is written in a very attractive style, and by the picturesqueness of its descriptions brings vividly before the reader the few but striking incidents of the Saint's life. At the same time it aims at interpreting to us what it relates, by explaining how grace and nature combined to produce, in the short space of eighteen years, such a masterpiece of sanctity.'

"Piccol giovane, ma gran santo,"—such was the antithesis which Urban VIII. adopted with reference to Stanislas when speaking of him to the Bishop of Wilna; 'a little youth, but a great saint.' Like some cherub fresh from the hands of his Creator, who earned his beatitude in one blessed moment, by one perfect holocaust of self, by one inexpressible act of charity, the worth of which cannot be measured by time, Stanislas appeared ripe for glory from the moment that the light which lighteth every man who cometh into the world dawned on his young reason; and if he tarried on earth for a few short years, one might almost deem him left rather that we might have the boon of beholding him than in order to complete a spiritual stature which seemed, as it were, finished as soon as begun" (p. 5).

With this extract we take our leave of a book for which we augur great popularity, and which we trust will speedily be followed by the other lives which are now in preparation for the series.

The Landing of S. Augustine. A Narrative in Verse intended for Recitation. By the Very Reverend Canon OAKELEY, M.A. London: Burns. Price 3d.

THESE few pages will recall to many persons now in the bosom of the Church recollections of more than thirty years ago, when the Oxford movement was in its beginning, and when those who heard the name of Mr. Oakeley, among those likely to be carried away with it, used to shake their heads, incredulous of the fact that any one on whom the taste and the talent for elegant literature was so much developed would really give himself up to theology. Grace is stronger than nature, and has prevailed in this as in many other cases. The tract before us contains a spirited and beautiful version of the immortal history of S. Augustine and S. Gregory, in some two hundred lines, of the metre of "Marmion," and peculiarly well adapted for recitation both by metre and shortness. They "were written at the request of Mr. S. M. Bellew, and had the advantage of being recited in public by that gentleman. They are now printed, chiefly for the use of colleges and schools. The historical incidents on which they are founded are too well known to require explanation, but it may be added that the subject was suggested to the writer by the graphic description of S. Augustine's landing, in the first of Dean Stanley's Historical Papers in the 'Memorials of Canterbury.'"

The Religious Reading Book for the use of Catholic Schools. By a Diocesan Inspector. No. 1, suitable for children in Standards II. and III. London: Burns, Oates, & Co.

THIS excellent and useful little book has the great advantage of being in a capital bold type, and is, in this and other respects, exactly what children want. It gives the substance of Scripture history from the Creation to the giving of the Law, and from the Annunciation of our Blessed Lady to the Ascension. The language is studiously plain and easy; and (what we consider a great advantage) the compiler has not made the mistake of confining it to words of one syllable. Every one who tries the experiment must at once see that many words of one syllable are both more difficult and also, as a general rule, less useful to a child when learned. No doubt, such words as cat, dog, &c., are easy; but this is not merely because each has only one syllable, but also because that syllable is a simple one. But a word of two such simple syllables is far easier to a child than one consisting of a single, more complex syllable. Try, for instance, any child beginning to read, upon two such words as "strength" and "power," and you will find that he reads the two syllables much the easiest. Besides, when a writer is bound to confine himself to words of one syllable, he is forced to use many out-of-the-way words, which are comparatively rare in other books or in conversation. Now, these words, even when learned, are less useful to a learner. What he wants is to learn first the words he is sure to meet with most frequently. For, observe, none of us really read by syllables. Our eye becomes accustomed to the look of a word as a whole; and when we see it again, we do not look at its syllables separately, but at the whole. The proof of this is, that any man, however much in the habit of reading aloud, when he falls upon any long combination of syllables which he never saw before (whether it is some unknown word, or some proper name), is sure to hesitate for a moment; and it is quite a chance whether he reads it the first time right or wrong. It is just the same with children learning to read. When they have read a word two or three times, they know it by sight and recognize it as a whole, without thinking of the separate letters or syllables. A new word they are obliged to spell. And hence, many of the best teachers now teach, not syllables but words; having a little box with many simple words printed each upon a separate card. It is therefore important to the child to become early familiar with the words which it is likely to meet oftenest; and this it fails to do if confined to words of one syllable.

This little book contains weighty and blessed truths in language perfectly plain and simple. Indeed, our only doubt is whether the writer has not in one respect carried this all-important principle too far. It may be that his more extended experience has suggested what we question; but we cannot help thinking that it would be better to leave unchanged words with which a Catholic child is sure to be familiar, even before it learns to read. For instance, the answer of our Blessed Lady to the angel would surely be as in-

telligible to any Catholic child as the substitute for them :—"Here am I for God to do what He likes with me, for I am His servant. Let it be done as you say." Neither do we see that "you" is more intelligible than "thou," while as being familiar, while "Thou" is reverend, we should be particularly sorry to accustom the ears of a child to hear it used in addressing our Blessed Lady, or, even more, our Lord. Why, for instance, should a child be taught to think that S. Peter said to Him,—"Lord, if it is you, tell me to come to you on the water."

We feel the more strongly on this point because, as *vous* in French is reverend, and *tu* familiar, and, as therefore, vous isrightly used in such cases, there are grown-up people absurd enough to adopt, in English, the familiar term "you" instead of the reverend term "thou." It would be a pity indeed should the ears of any child be reconciled to such an usage by early habit.

A Hundred Sonnets. By JOHN CHARLES EARLE, B.A. Oxon. London : John Camden Hotten.

MR. EARLE has got the gift of writing sonnets in a remarkable degree, and it is an uncommon gift. It has been a favourite exercise of great poets, and one in which they have not uniformly succeeded, for the conditions of success, though few, are strict. The sonnet must be in its way simply complete, *totus teres atque rotundus.* There is no fifteenth line to which the meaning can be turned over, and the relation of the fourteen lines each to each are adjusted by rules almost as strict as those of geometry. Nevertheless a good sonnet must wear an air of absolute ease, as if it was only from utter exhaustion of its meaning that it stopped where it does, and must move in its rigid fetters as if they were wreaths of flowers. In his hundred experiments, Mr. Earle has tried the sonnet in its every mood, always with fair, sometimes with signal success, of which the best proof we can give, is to ask our readers to contrast the following three :—

"THE RENEGADE.

YOUR ample brow had not a wrinkle then ;
  Your mouth was ringed with smiles ; your eye shone bright ;
You seemed the meekest, happiest of men,
  Your heart so single, and your spring so light ;
  Your judgment clear, your footsteps ordered right.
But all is changed, yea, sadly changed, from when
  I knew you first : you cavil at the Light,
And gainsay all to which you cried amen.
So have I seen a good ship newly tarred
  And painted, with her sails set, clear the rocks,
Serenely thread the straits, and breast unmarred
  The outer serf, then, tossed in tidal shocks,
Return dismasted, leaky, tempest-scarred,
  And tugged to wretched moorings in the docks."

"THE ASSUMPTION.

I CANNOT think they love the Lord aright,
Or by His promised Spirit have been taught,
Who from His mother derogate in aught,
And grudgingly withhold her sovereign right,
And find one speck upon her shield of light,
And deem the sacred vessel which has brought
Incarnate God into the world is naught
But dust still soddening in the crypts of night.
No! rather let me cleave to what they say
Who love the legends of the East to reap,
That when Apostles on an August day
Come to the spot where Mary fell on sleep,
They found, where late her precious body lay,
Nought but some fragrant lilies in a heap."

" THE NIGHTINGALE'S RETURN.

WHERE hast thou been these nine months, dulcet bird?
Have Bagdad's maidens listened to the swell
Of thy shrill music amid citrons heard?
Or hast thou showered on Hydra's asphodel
Clear notes prolonged beside some marble well?
Or trilled thy song of love hard by the herd
Of antelopes? or where Nile's cataracts fell
Did lotus, palm, and melon, catch thy word?
I take it kindly of thee that at last
Thou art come back to us without a call:
No Syrian groves or blooms could hold thee fast,
Nor thy quick brain to such extent inthrall
But this instinctive preference through it passed—
'The English woods and roses beat them all!'"

The Art of Poetry of Horace, with Translations in Prose and Verse. By the Very Rev. DANIEL BAGOT, B.D., Dean of Dromore, Vicar-General of Newry and Morne, and Chaplain to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1869.

THOUGH Horace's Art of Poetry is not strictly an essay in verse on that important subject, but a familiar letter addressed to Piso, yet it embodies most of the golden rules of the art, and will continue, as long as literature shall last, to be one of the best exemplars of their application. Hence it has always been a general favourite; and, being free from that license of expression which marks so many of Horace's compositions, it is expected to form an item in the studies of every well-educated Catholic. It is the more obnoxious to criticism because it is essentially critical; but from this ordeal it has ever had much to gain and nothing to fear. To translate well so pithy and faultless a production is anything but an easy task, and

Dean Bagot has shown no small courage in attempting it. He seems to have thought it hopeless to represent the original in an equal, or nearly equal, number of words and lines, and has, therefore, been obliged in many cases to expand Horace's terse measure. He amplifies the original, not indeed to the utmost, but sufficiently to develop the author's entire meaning; in the prose, he does this with great advantage to the learner, and in the verse, without weakening and watering down the ideas more than is simply inevitable in a translation. Sometimes we find him beating out one or two Latin words into a very wide spread of gold leaf, as when he renders *molles capillos* by "soft flowing tresses—tresses that look like burnished threads of gold." Usually, however, the Dean is not so diffuse, and confines himself to such similes and illustrations as are contained or implied in the text. Now and then he is peculiarly happy in condensing Horace's lines into an equal number of English iambics. Thus:—

> "*Versibus impariter junctis* querimonia primum,
> Post etiam inclusa est voti sententia compos,"

is rendered—

> "First plaintive strains *lines elegiac* move,
> Then vows of lovers realized in love."

We are, in the present day, deluged with what is called poetry, yet we believe that very little which deserves the name issues from the press. Wherever it is really found, it has in it a principle of vitality which is proof against the shocks of time and the blows of fate. It is not washed down into oblivion when the season is over, nor sold for waste paper after long residence on dusty shelves. It is so rare that men account it precious, and hoard it as a treasure. But, not only is true poetry scarce, we are persuaded that good versification also is seldom to be met with. Writers whose thoughts and expressions are commonplace are not likely to bestow patient care on the elaboration of work which they feel cannot last long. Perhaps, too, there is a closer connection than people generally suppose between the art and the spirit of poetry. Wherever the art of making verses is present in a remarkable degree, the spirit will not be wanting. The workmanship and the *afflatus* will go together. Images really beautiful will be conveyed by due procession of sound and "music in the bounds of law." Many "poets," as they are called, in our day habitually defy the rules of art, as though they were superior to them; but such carelessness and presumption ought not, in our opinion, to be condoned. If rhyme, for example, be adopted, it ought to be adhered too strictly and under all circumstances. In a translation like that before us, the difficulty there may be in rendering the original into the vulgar tongue ought not to be an excuse for occasional slipshod rhymes, such as "storm," with "alarm," "God" with "clad," "can" with "vein," and some half-dozen others.

It will be said, probably, that a thousand examples of such loose rhyming may be found in Pope, Byron, and other masters of heroic measure, and that a recent critic—Mr. Rossetti—has, in his edition of Shelley's works, vindicated such indifference to correct rhyming on principle. But to this we reply, that

no examples whatever can justify breach of the rules of art; that loose rhymes are blemishes — they balk the ear which is intend to drink in music. Dean Bagot can be charged with very few such offences in the entire translation of the "Art of Poetry," which consists of 834 lines. These, however, may easily be corrected in a future edition. On the whole, we are highly pleased with the Dean's performance; it is vigorous, flowing, scholarly, and exact. He thoroughly appreciates the force and beauty of the original, and his translations in prose and verse, taken together, form an admirable commentary on one of the most valuable pieces bequeathed to us by antiquity.

NOTE CONCERNING MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS.

In reply to the inquiry of our reverend correspondent, "Clericus Scotiæ," it is hardly necessary to say that the literature of the controversy regarding the life and character of Mary, Queen of Scots, is most voluminous. The chief contemporary authorities were, on her side, Bishop Leslie, and on the other side, Buchanan. But it was not until the last century that the historical evidence came to be carefully examined. Robertson and Laing, in the general History of Scotland, entered at great detail into all the questions regarding Mary Stuart; and Goodall, Whitaker, and the elder Tytler devoted special treatises to the subject. Of these, by far the most careful and scholarlike is that of Tytler, grandfather of the late Patrick Frazer Tytler, author of the well-known "History of Scotland."

With these publications, the interest of the subject for a time died out; but it was revived about thirty years since by the publication of a large body of new evidence in the vast collection of papers illustrative of the life of Mary Stuart, made by Prince Alexander Labanoff; and by the new studies on the subject—founded on these and other original materials—of Miss Strickland, in her "Lives of the Queens of Scotland"; and of Mr. Patrick Frazer Tytler, in his "History of Scotland." Of these writers, Miss Strickland is decidedly favourable; Mr. Tytler is, at the least, less favourable than was his grandfather in the "Inquiry" referred to above. They were followed by M. Mignet in an elaborate essay in two volumes, the whole tendency of which was hostile to Mary; and by Mr. Burton in his "History of Scotland," whose view is equally hostile. Still more violent and almost fanatical is the record of the career of the Scottish Queen in Mr. Froude's "History of England," the very excesses of which have led to a strong re-action in her favour, evinced by the works of Mr. MacNeil Caird and Mr. Hosack, reviewed in a recent number. Mr. Hosack's book is by far the most careful summary of the evidence which has yet been made; and in that work, supplemented by Miss Strickland's "Life of Mary, Queen of Scots," and M. Wiesener's "Marie Stuart et le Comte de Bothwell"; and, still more, the same author's essay, entitled "Marie Stuart et ses derniers Historiens," published in the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, livraisons 8—10, 1868 our correspondent will find all the best that has been written on the subject since the publication of the new historical evidence recently brought to light.

THE

DUBLIN REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1870.

ART. I.—THE CONVENT COMMITTEE.

Reports of the Evidence before the House of Commons Committee on Conventual Institutions. Tablet. Numbers from May 28 to July 30. 1870.

THE late attack on the convents came upon us as much by surprise as one of the "white storms" which, in the middle of a day of sunny calm, are wont to rush down from the recesses of Mount Pilatus upon the lakes of Switzerland. It was soon over, and some of us may perhaps be tempted to forget it. But there was much in it which it is important that Catholics should not forget, and we therefore return to it.

Most of us, probably, were ignorant even that notice of any motion on the subject had been given. Certainly no one had any fear that it would be carried; and when the *Times* of March 30th announced that Mr. Newdegate had obtained a majority, which directed the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the "existence, character, and increase of conventual and monastic institutions or societies in Great Britain, and into the terms upon which income, property, and estates belonging to such institutions or societies and the members thereof, are respectively received, held, and possessed," we were as little prepared as if such a thing had never before been talked of. In fact, whether Mr. Newdegate intended it or not, what actually happened was a thing very common in war: we had become so much accustomed to feigned attacks that the real one took us absolutely by surprise.

No need to detail what followed. Catholics of every class were roused to a degree of vehement indignation, at which not only Mr. Newdegate and his crew of fanatics, but the mass of Protestants, expressed an astonishment which we have no doubt was sincere. The Duke of Norfolk, Sir Charles Clifford, and Mr. Langdale, who happened to be in London, at once put themselves at the head of the movement. The newspapers for some weeks were charged with letters, some bearing real, some feigned names, some in favour of Mr. Newdegate, some

against him, and, with leading articles, the great majority of which were wholly on his side. At last came the fight in Parliament. The usual course in such cases is that, after the House has sanctioned the appointment of a select committee, the member by whom the proposal was made moves that the committee shall consist of such and such members. He is, of course, one of its members. Usually he adds a certain number of those who are supposed most nearly to agree with him, about as many of those most opposed to him, and about as many more, men not committed either way, but considered likely to be fair and valuable judges. His motion also defines the power and duties of his committee, empowering it, for instance, to send for persons, papers, &c. And it often happens that some member moves "that it shall be an instruction to the committee" to inquire into this or that point; or, again, not to enter upon this or that subject, as it may seem expedient to different sections in the House. The committee thus constituted holds its sittings in one of the rooms of the edifice called by the law "the Palace of Westminster," and by mortals, "the Houses of Parliament," and in due time makes its report. This is usually a paper of a few pages, sometimes not more than a few lines. But with it, as a general rule, is published "the evidence" given before the committee, and this usually swells the report into a folio volume more or less massy, printed in double columns, and covered with dark blue paper, which is technically called a "Blue Book." These volumes, which accumulate wonderfully every year, are supplied *gratis* to members of the House, and sold at cost price to such of the public as think it worth while to buy them. By how many of either class they are really read is a question upon which we should not like to venture an opinion. That they are very generally referred to and quoted is beyond question.

The natural course of things then would have been, that Mr. Newdegate should have moved that his committee should consist of such and such persons; but he found the drawing up of the list no easy task. Many members who, in their secret hearts, would be glad enough to see convents come to grief, would strongly dislike to take any prominent part against them. Besides, Mr. Newdegate had long ago made himself so conspicuous as an assailant of everything Catholic, that he could not help knowing, that even if he were allowed to nominate a committee after his own heart, its report would carry no weight with moderate men, and that if his list were opposed, as it was sure to be, the fact of its being his would dispose them to vote against it. He therefore determined to evade the task. Now there exists a small body of members called the "Committee of Selection."

They are appointed each Parliament, for quite different purposes, but upon them Mr. Newdegate resolved to throw the responsibility, and therefore moved that the committee of inquiry upon convents should be nominated by the Committee of Selection. On the other hand, Mr. Cogan, an Irish Catholic county member, seconded by the lamented Sir John Simeon, then the only Catholic representing an English constituency, gave notice of an amendment that the order for appointing a committee should be discharged. At the same time the chairman and members of the Committee of Selection increased Mr. Newdegate's difficulties, by earnestly repudiating the proposal that they should have anything to do with the matter. After an adjournment of the debate and some delays (which Mr. Newdegate, of course, attributed to the Jesuits), the matter was taken up by Mr. Gladstone, who had voted against his original motion, and who now proposed a compromise. This was, that the order for Mr. Newdegate's committee should be discharged, and that, instead of it, a committee should be appointed to inquire into "the state of the law" with regard to conventual and monastic institutions, and into their property; thus leaving out the words "the existence, character, and increase," which stood in Mr. Newdegate's original motion; and which would have authorized him to hold a strict inquisition into every detail of convent life, and into every foul story which any one might be pleased to invent to the discredit of any nun or any community, and to carry it out by dragging from their cloisters any number of religious ladies to be publicly examined and cross-examined by him, upon the details of every suspicion which has ever passed through his mind, however outrageous and insulting the very mention of such a suspicion might be.

Mr. Newdegate, indeed, wrote to the *Times* (which on this occasion took exactly his own line) resenting the suspicion that any member of Parliament would "wantonly insult any inmate of a convent, lady superior, or any other nun, whom they might find it necessary to examine." The words prove that he was looking forward to the pleasure of cross-examining the nuns as to the "character" of their institutions and daily life; and his assumed indignation at the expectation that he would carry on that examination in a tone of wanton insult would have come with a better grace before he had publicly associated himself with Murphy, whose whole life is spent in publicly propagating the foulest calumnies against them.

The effect of Mr. Gladstone's motion was that the House divided twice, first upon the question whether the order for Mr. Newdegate's inquiry should be discharged; then on the

question whether or not the inquiry conceded by Mr. Gladstone should take place. The House was as much crowded as it is when a question upon which the fate of a ministry depends, is to come on. In the first division, in which Mr. Gladstone was opposed by Mr. Newdegate, he had a majority of 281 against 171 (including twenty-two pairs). On the last, in which Mr. Gladstone and his party voted with their usual opponents, and were opposed by the mass of the Catholic members, he had 348 ayes against 57 noes. And thus ended the first act of the contest. Mr. Gladstone, on whom the task of nominating the committee now fell, soon produced his list, which was accepted by the House; and his committee, after sitting to the end of the parliamentary session, has resolved merely to submit to the House the evidence it has up to this time received, without making any report upon it. It does not, however, consider its work over, but proposes to resume the hearing of evidence when Parliament again meets, and after that, we presume, to make a report.

In looking back on the fierce struggle which ended in the appointment of Mr. Gladstone's Committee, it is impossible not to be struck by the curious fact that it was tacitly assumed from first to last, alike by the assailants and the defenders of the convents, and in Parliament and the press alike, that the real question in debate was, not whether an inquiry about convents should be made by a select committee of the House of Commons (although that was the only question nominally under discussion), but whether a law should be passed establishing a permanent system of visitation for all convents by inspectors to be appointed by Government. The common sense of all parties told them that this was really the point in dispute. That it should have been so is remarkable, because it showed that those who demanded an investigation by a Parliamentary Committee had really prejudged the whole question into which it was to inquire. Mr. Newdegate is not a sharp-sighted man, or one of very refined feeling. Yet even he, at last, felt how unbecoming was the position in which he stood as a man demanding investigation, and yet assuming that the nuns, about whom he professed that he wished to bring them to a fair trial, had already been found guilty. So awkward did he feel this, that on May 2nd he tried to persuade the House that what he wanted was not inspection but inquiry. But this came too late. The attempt was not only disingenuous but absurd, for his own speeches throughout had been based on the assertion that convents are houses at the door of which the power of the law of England absolutely ceases,—that in every convent there are numbers of inmates eager to escape, but retained by compulsion. Nay, his

favourite argument was, that it could be no injustice to subject convents to Government inspection because lunatic asylums are already inspected. This argument, of course, assumed as its first principle that inmates are kept in convents, as they avowedly are in lunatic asylums, against their will. In like manner, the *Times*, which went wholly with him day after day, headed its articles and correspondence on the subject, not "Convent Inquiry," but "Inspection of Convents," and all its arguments were directed to this one point, not that the conventual system was imperfectly understood and ought to be inquired into and better known, but that it was ascertained to be fundamentally evil and ought to be controlled.

Accordingly, the discussion turned wholly upon silly stories, such as are always brought forward by the assailants of convents. The newspapers, for weeks together, were filled with letters about ineffectual attempts to escape on the part of one nun or another, and with answers refuting them. Of these last, one of the most important, effectually disposing of a favourite case of the kind, was written from Rome by the Bishop of Birmingham.

Into this controversy we have no space to enter—and, indeed, it would be weary work. Catholics (who, of course, constitute the great majority of our readers) are, for the most part, personally acquainted with convents; and whoever is so is well aware that nothing could well be more grossly absurd than the supposition that any community would wish to retain a reluctant inmate; except, indeed, the other supposition, that if the wish existed it could by any possibility be carried into execution. Any reasonable Protestant (if, indeed, any such really have doubts upon the question) may, with perfect ease, gain the same information. And as to the mass of those who believe, take up, and repeat the common charges, we cannot help fearing that their delusion is not so much in the intellect as in the will, and that, upon them, no logical proof of the absurdity of their notions, however clear it might be, would produce any real effect. One thing alone ought to convince such persons, if they were capable of conviction. It is, that the stories about nuns escaping or attempting to escape are perpetually changing their venue and their circumstances. One is disproved, and immediately another is brought forward, and is disposed of in its turn. If any one of them were well-founded, it would certainly keep its place and not be abandoned for others, each of which in its turn follows it into oblivion. Thirty years ago there were rumours of cruelties and hardships within our union workhouses and in gaols. The fact is, that there was, in both cases, only too much ground for these

rumours. And therefore those who demanded, first an inquiry and afterwards a reform, took care to insist upon one or two cases, the grossest and best established. They were not continually bringing forward a new story, and as soon as it was clearly refuted, without having the candour to admit that it was so, going on to bring forward another. They obtained proof that one or two were true, and on the strength of that they demanded and obtained a change in the law. Nothing could be more opposite to this than the line adopted by the assailants of convents. They are always changing from one story to another; because, in truth, there is no one in proof of which anything plausible is to be said.

And why is this? Because the whole thing depends, not upon any facts which have been misunderstood or misreported, and the disproof or explanation of which will satisfy those who appeal to them, but, as Dr. Newman long ago so ably showed, upon an inveterate prejudice. Who that has ever read it can forget that wonderful lecture, in which he traces in detail the manner in which the prejudiced man simply sets aside all argument and all proof, so that the only effect of disproving what he has always taken for granted, is to make him angry, that things of which he is certain that they must be true, should be so plausibly refuted. It is one from which it is impossible to make any quotation without injustice, for not a word of it can be spared. He concludes:—

Alas! though we have laughed at the extravagance which shows itself in such instances of prejudice, it is, in truth, no matter for jest. If I laugh, it is to hide the deep feelings of various kinds which it necessarily excites in the mind. I laugh at what is laughable in the displays of this wretched root of evil in order to turn away my thoughts from its nature and effects, which are not laughable, but hateful and dangerous—dangerous to the Catholic, hateful to the Supreme Judge. When you see a beast of prey in its cage, you are led to laugh at its impotent fury, at its fretful motions and its sullen air, and its grotesque expressions of impatience, disappointment, and malice, if it is baulked of its revenge. And as to this prejudice, really in itself it is one of the direst, most piteous, most awful phenomena in the whole country, to see a noble, generous people the victims of a moral infirmity, which is now a fever, now an ague, now a falling sickness, now a S. Vitus's dance. O, if we could see as the angels see, thus should we speak of it, and in language far more solemn. O, is it possible that so many, many men, and women too, good and kind otherwise, should take delight in being sure that millions of men have upon them the seal and sign of the evil one? O, is it conceivable that they can be considerate in all matters of this life, friendly in social intercourse, indulgent to the wayward, charitable to the poor and outcast, merciful towards criminals, nay, kind towards the inferior creation, towards their cows, and horses, and swine; yet, as regards us, who bear the same

form, speak the same tongue, breathe the same air, and walk the same streets, ruthless, relentless, believing ill of us, and wishing to believe it. I repeat it—they wish us to be what they believe us to be; what a portentous fact! . . . . And hence it is, that calm as may be the sky and gentle the breeze, we cannot trust the morning. At any moment a furious tempest may be raised against us, and scatter calamity through our quiet homes, as long as the prince of the power of the air retains the sovereignty. There is ever a predisposition in the political and social atmosphere to lour and thicken. We are never secure against the access of madness in that people, whose name and blood we share. Some accident—a Papal Bull, worded as Papal documents have been since the beginning of time; a sudden scandal among our priests or in our convents; or some bold, reckless falsehood may raise all England against us. Such was also our condition in the first ages of the Church. The chance of the hour brought the Pagan Romans upon us. A Christian tore down the Imperial manifesto from its place, and the terrible Diocletian persecution was the consequence. A crop failed; it was all through the Christians.

But we must not go on. It is our deep sense of the truth of all that is said in that chapter which makes it weary work to answer any particular story of scandal—it makes little difference what it is—a Colwich nun case—a Saurin case—the case of a novice in the Brompton Oratory—anything will do; for our countrymen have made up their minds beforehand that whatever may be charged against us, and whether or not it can be proved, we are really guilty of much worse, and that the only reason why our guilt is not proved in any particular case, if so it be, is that we are preternaturally cunning and unscrupulous in concealing our crimes. We shall not, then, enter into the details of any of the stories which were showered upon us during the brief period of the late storm. But one word about the popular prejudice we must say. The popular suspicion embraces two classes of subjects. First, there is a widespread suspicion, strongest perhaps among the classes uneducated or half educated, but not by any means confined to them, of which the *Spectator* wrote when this storm first broke out:—

Half the dislike still entertained in England towards the theological system [of the Catholics] is based upon a traditional suspicion of the monastic establishments. The suspicion has never been justified in this country; and is in itself not a little unreasonable. There are 800,000 women in England who neither are nor ever can be married, and nobody suspects them on that account of unchastity; but if a score or so of them agree, from religious motives, to live together a life of self-denial and ceremonial observances, the worthy public assures itself that all manner of horrors are going on. Hundreds of groups of labourers may be herding together in Scotch bothies, and nobody cares except a few philanthropists; but if a group of cultivated men think a

contemplative life lived in common would best suit their religious needs, the aid of the State is invoked to see what they are all about.

It is difficult to speak of this loathsome and detestable suspicion. But, unhappily, how firm and deeply-seated it is can be imagined by no one who is not intimately acquainted with the thoughts and feelings of English Protestants. It crops up in the strangest way, when nobody expects to see or hear anything connected with it. The writer walked by chance into an assize court, not knowing what was going on. It turned out to be a trial in which the character of a married Protestant lady was implicated, and it happened to come out that on a certain occasion she had been at an inn in London called "The Three Nuns." No sort of evidence had been given to show that the inn was not most respectable, but the name produced a thrill through the court and the jury, and the counsel was obliged to intervene by protesting that "whatever may have been its character in times past, it is now quite respectable." The name by itself seemed to the audience sufficient proof of something monstrous. Then, again, look at the career of such a man as Murphy. He lives by appealing to this filthy prejudice in its grossest form. Wherever there is a convent of religious ladies there he is sure to go, and for years afterwards the middle and lower classes in its neighbourhood believe and circulate among themselves stories of gross licentiousness openly practised in it. It is admitted that the influence of his lectures, more than any one other cause, gained Lancashire for the Tories at the last general election. And yet, if the obscene element were struck out of his lectures, there would, in fact, be nothing left. We are aware that when Murphy is mentioned respectable people will repudiate him. "He is a low fellow; nobody cares what he says," as the *Times* declared the morning after Mr. Newdegate's majority—"No reasonable man will listen to the extravagant, if not malicious, pictures which identify such institutions with nothing but ignorance and debasement. They have a strange attraction for some of the finest spirits, and they could not have maintained their vitality for fifteen hundred years without answering in some degree a natural impulse." So much common sense no doubt would infer, although a higher faculty would suggest that the attraction might perhaps be not natural but supernatural. But when such tools as Murphy are so contemptuously disavowed, it is well to remember, not only that Mr. Whalley avowed that Murphy had been sent by him (for Murphy and Whalley will by most persons be admitted to stand on the same level of respectability), but that Mr. Newdegate himself, only a few weeks

before he obtained the vote for this Committee, had deliberately identified himself with Murphy, when he was unceremoniously mentioned in the House of Commons.

It is the extreme baseness and obscenity of the prevalent suspicion which makes it impossible that Catholics should come frankly forward to meet and dispel the prejudice on which it is founded. The *Spectator* indeed says, "We have often wondered why English Catholics did not of themselves apply for inspection. It would be just as easy to appoint female as male inspectors, and the reports of competent, keen-eyed Protestant ladies, made under a sense of responsibility, would relieve the convents of a load of obloquy under which they are now quite needlessly content to remain. Nobody would disbelieve Miss Nightingale or Miss Martineau, or any woman of their kind."

We do not greatly wonder that a Protestant so conspicuously fair and candid as are the writers in the *Spectator* should imagine this. But we fear it shows that he does not understand the obstinacy and intensity of a prejudice such as that with which we have to contend. It seems to us that if any one so implacably hates the Catholic religion, as to take it for granted that a score of English ladies, living together for religious and charitable purposes, must necessarily be harlots and murderesses, only because they are Catholics, he must be far beyond the reach of any argument or any testimony whatever. But, even if we were mistaken here, any such compromise is made impossible to Catholics by the nature of the charges made against the convents (charges which Mr. Newdegate by making himself responsible for Murphy has formally adopted), and which are circulated broadcast through every town and village of the land, by associations which call themselves religious, and have shown their religion by reprinting in a cheap form, for wholesale circulation, such obscene books as "Maria Monk." "A Catholic," writing to the *Spectator* in answer to this suggestion, says—

> The peculiar feelings of veneration with which we regard religious ladies we do not expect Protestants to enter into. But, to say nothing of these feelings, they are, to say the least, our sisters and daughters. Is it possible that we should, upon any prudential considerations, accept an arrangement which not only contemplates it as possible that they are harlots and murderesses, but that, compared with other women, they are exceptionally likely to be so? Is there any Protestant gentleman in England who would not rather shed his blood than have such an outrage offered, with his connivance, to his own sisters or daughters? Why should it be assumed that we alone are without the feelings of honour which are common to all our countrymen?

So it is—we cannot meet the popular prejudice, because its foulness would make it a degradation to meet it. The next

form which it takes is a shade less degrading; it is that nuns are kept in religious houses by force. So far this is less outrageous, because it is founded on a mistaken view of Catholic principles, which the other and coarser prejudice is not. No man ever suspected that licentiousness and murder are enjoined or sanctioned by the Catholic religion. But that the Catholic religion requires that nuns should be kept in their convents by force, people do imagine. It is, of course, a puzzle between moral obligation and compulsion. That a professed nun, who should break her vows by leaving her convent, would commit a sin, no Catholic doubts. Protestants jump to the conclusion that therefore whenever they wish to leave they are confined against their will. The strange absurdity of this is that it would, of course, apply equally to every wife in England. The truth is, the prejudice that nuns are shut up against their will is instilled into Protestant children in the nursery. We have heard an educated convert say that after he had been a Catholic for months, he saw in the *Tablet* the suggestion that the bars and gratings on a convent window might be intended to prevent people from breaking in, not from breaking out; and it struck him at once as a wholly new idea. And no wonder, for when he was almost an infant he had been accustomed to play at games which turned upon the attempts of nuns to escape, and the tricks by which they deceived their abbess into supposing they were all in the convent when she came round at night to count them. Still, ingrained as the notion is, it is strange that it should not be shaken when people have had any opportunity of seeing what convents are really like; which, one would think, must by this time be the case with most English Protestants. Not to say that nothing could be more intolerable in a community life than a member who was really pining or fretting to make her escape, and that nothing is less likely than that her companions should wish to retain her, it must surely be evident to any Protestant who has seen what our convents are, that of all equally large houses in England, a convent is precisely that in which it would be physically impossible to retain any reluctant prisoners. In the mass of them there are pupils, in a vast number poor schools, working classes, industrial schools: in all there is a number of inmates very far beyond those in any other house of the size. Now we are far from saying that Mr. Newdegate is keeping any one, whether man or woman, imprisoned in his country house. But we do most positively protest that he is a thousand times more likely to have one than any convent in England. Only think what a scandal it would be if the wife, or brother, or sister, nephew or niece of

the great Protestant champion should turn Papist. Yet there is hardly a family which has not had some near relative a convert within the last twenty years. We have not the honour to be acquainted with Mr. Newdegate's highly respectable family. Is it certain that no one of its members has ever disappeared? Is there no lady who is said to have married and gone abroad? No young man who is supposed to have gone to India? How will Mr. Newdegate prove that he, she, or they (as the Acts of Parliament say) are not now carefully shut up in Arbury House? We are as far from saying it is so, as Mr. Newdegate from asserting that there is any nun imprisoned in the convent at Stone. But this we do say, it is far easier to imagine the temptation in his case than in the other, and moreover it would be a thousand times easier for him to do it than it would for the Stone nuns. In an old-fashioned country house there are so many out-of-the-way nooks and corners. Then, if the victim should cry out, who would ever hear her in the middle of an extensive park? Convents mostly stand in situations in which no one could scream out without being heard, and (as one of the Protestant papers said), "in that single case every soul in the population is ready to act as a voluntary detective, to go beyond the law in aiding the person supposed to be under restraint." We are confident that any sober-minded person who really considers the matter will feel that, absurd as would be a law to enact that all houses in England above a certain size (with the single exception of convents), should be regularly visited by inspectors, in order to see that no person is illegally imprisoned in them, such a law would be much less absurd than one for the inspection of convents.

People whose minds are occupied by fancies so grotesque are not subjects of reasoning, else we might ask what the inspectors are to do. Suppose Mr. Newdegate himself to be the inspector. Do they suppose that when he enters a convent parlour, the superior will give orders to her gaolers, "Bring down the prisoners," and that at once all the hapless women who have been for years in chains, secluded from light, air, and human society, will be ushered into the room for him to examine? Or, if not, is he to search the house? When he has examined all the parlours, corridors, and cells, the refectory, the chapel, the recreation-rooms, and has found no one, what is to be his next step? Is he to have the floors taken up, or the curtains taken down, that he may judge whether there is any concealed den beneath or behind them? And, if not, how could his report that he had found nothing even make it in the least degree less probable that there was something to find? How would any

one person who now suspects be less suspicious if, as the *Spectator* suggests, the inspector were Miss Nightingale or Miss Martineau?

We beg our readers' pardon for wasting time in examining demands so transparent in their absurdity. The simple fact is, that it is not the convent but the Catholic religion which is the real object of jealousy. The mass of English people are most anxious for religious liberty, provided always that people make use of it for the purpose of joining one of the popular forms of Protestantism. If high in the social scale, it is becoming that they should belong to the Established Church. There is no offence in the fact of a tradesman belonging to it, although it is more natural that he should be a Wesleyan or an Independent. If he professes to belong to any of these, he may, without much offence, believe as much and as little as he likes. A peer or a country gentleman may even be a Catholic, if that has always been the religion of his family, and if he keeps quiet, like a member of an inferior caste. There is something aristocratic in his adherence to it. He would hardly give more pleasure by abandoning it than by altering the livery or the coat of arms of his family. But what really gives offence is to see Catholics acting as if they really believed men have as much right to belong to their religion as to any other. The *Saturday Review* very truly says,—"The English mind shows no objection to Roman Catholics if they would only not so perversely carry out their religion into practice." Accordingly, what Mr. Newdegate really complains of is not any abuse in convents, but their existence. He writes to the *Times*, April 11th, that he should not care for them if they were not continually multiplying, and the *Times* re-echoes his outcry in a leading article. "In 1830 there were no monasteries in England, and only eleven convents; there are now said to be no fewer than sixty-nine monasteries and 238 convents. Moreover the increase has been very rapid of late; seventy-one convents and fourteen monasteries have been added within the last seven years."

This is exactly the sort of outcry which everywhere meets us. It would be no answer to say (what, however, is perfectly certain) that this is our way of working—that to talk of allowing liberty to the Catholic Church, and then to cry out because it multiplies centres of community life both for men and women, is as unmeaning and self-contradictory as to pretend to allow full liberty to the Wesleyans and Quakers, only to require as the one condition that at all their religious meetings they should have the church prayers read by a legally ordained minister, in a surplice, and should never hold experience meetings, or silent meetings, or meetings to be addressed by any one that may be "moved."

The simple fact is, that the first endeavour of a Catholic priest engaged in gathering into a congregation a number of poor and long-neglected Irish Catholics in one of our towns, is to try whether he cannot get the assistance of some nuns. If he succeeds, then one more is added to the list of new communities, and there is a new outcry from Mr. Newdegate, echoed back by a leader in the *Times*. If any Protestant sect does the same thing, (*i.e.*, if it multiplies its own characteristic institutions in all parts of the country), that is only considered a satisfactory proof that it meets the necessities of English society and of our times—that it is supplying a great religious and social want, and should be encouraged and treated with special consideration. But as soon as the Catholic Church does the same thing, it is met with a cry through the country, and motions in Parliament, which (under whatever form of words their meaning may be concealed) mean only, that it should be put down by legislative interference. It is of little use to explain this, because the real wish of those who make the outcry is, that the Catholic Church should be allowed full religious liberty, on one condition—that condition being that it shall not extend its operations in England. Evident as this meaning is, it is not often openly avowed. We therefore attach considerable importance to the distinct statement of it made by Mr. Walter, the member for Berkshire, whose intimate connection with the *Times* makes it more especially valuable. Mr. Walter was arguing * that Lord John Russell's Penal Law (the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill) should be made much more stringent, and his reason was this,—"If the people of this country are once possessed with the idea that there existed any danger (a danger which he believed might exist, if measures were not taken to prevent it) of Roman Catholic unmarried priests being set up in their parishes side by side with the Protestant clergy; that there existed a danger of the death-beds, even of misers, being besieged, and their bequests intercepted by the emissaries of Rome; that there existed a danger of the confessional being introduced as a general rule into this country, and of the daughters of our Protestant fellow-subjects being seduced into convents (loud cries of hear)—if the people of England felt that the law could afford them no protection in such a case, he was very much mistaken in his estimate of their character if they would not be disposed to take the law into their own hands." This has at least one great merit, there is no possibility of mistaking what it means. It states what the danger is, viz., that Catholic priests should

* *Times*, March, 18, 1851.

be generally planted in the country, and the Catholic religion practised, as, *e.g.*, Wesleyanism now is (for the vague abuse, "misers' death-beds," and "daughters seduced," is surplusage). He urged that "measures should be taken to prevent this danger," that is, to prevent the free practice of the Catholic religion; and lastly, he threatened that if the House did not pass them the people of England would "take the law into their own hands." Nor did his tone suggest that he wished to discourage their doing so. What is this but the old cry, "*Christianos ad leonem*"? The *Saturday Review*, certainly not favourable to the Catholic religion, most truly says:—

"What Mr. Newdegate really wants is an extension of the present anomaly [*i.e.* of the law making void charitable bequests for Catholic purposes as 'superstitious uses']. He would have not only Roman Catholic endowments inspected, reported on, and if need be, prohibited, but Roman Catholic doctrine. He means something little distinguishable from persecution, only it is not so honest. . . . The old persecuting practice, which prohibited the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and made the saying of Mass a felony, was far more honest than to say that institutions which are the legitimate and inevitable result of doctrine should be prohibited. Mr. Newdegate says, of course, that he only wants to inquire. . . . But what is the use of knowing all this unless we are prepared to take the next step? We may dislike the confessional; but the question is, whether we are ready for the very logical method adopted by the distinguished controversialist (the Dean of Ripon), who proposed to make it felony in a clergyman to receive a confession. If Mr. Newdegate's Committee stops short of prohibitory legislation, the inquiry is a farce in fact and an insult in intention; while, as to the alleged object of wishing to consult the real interests of the English Romanists, we are stupid enough to think that they know their own interests best. Perversely, they can no more be brought to see that Mr. Newdegate's inspectors are a boon to them, than the Irish Bishops could see that they were disendowed and disestablished all for their own good."

The really serious consideration in all this is, that (as the same article says) "the great body of middle-class Englishmen openly proclaim and secretly detest the principle of religious freedom." Being themselves divided into a vast number of Protestant sects, they are naturally willing that all Protestant sects should be left alone. As to Catholics, they would gladly avoid the inconsistency and odium of persecuting them; but then this must be on the condition that nothing is heard about them; but if they will "perversely practise their religion," then—*quos ego!* It is evidently their own fault.

And especially, and above all things, they must not set up religious houses. Those who complain of their numbers are the very men who condemn the penal laws, by which the open development of the Catholic religion in England was prevented; and yet they always accompany their complaint with a boast that there were none in England before the beginning of the present century. In other words, they are glad enough that the persecuting laws should be abolished, if only Catholics will be content that without them their religion shall remain as it was when they were enforced, but not otherwise. This public multiplication of the religious houses of men and women is, in truth, the turning point. Saints, indeed, never have been, and never will be, wholly wanting in the world; but as long as they are mixed with the world, wearing its garb, and speaking its language, they lie hidden. That, the world admits itself bound to tolerate, little as it likes it. But that in the midst of a nation Protestant, wealthy, respectable, and imbued with nineteenth century principles, whole communities should be publicly gathered together, whose very existence, whose garb, whose countenances, whose daily lives recall the men and women of the first days of the Church, this is intolerable—this must, at all events, be put a stop to. A preacher in a Protestant congregation thirty years ago (when as yet monks and nuns hardly existed, at least visibly, in England), after painting in detail from the New Testament the lives of the first Christians, went on to touch this precise point—the feeling of the Protestant world about the religious orders.

Ask yourself this question, and be honest in your answer. This model of a Christian, though not commanding your literal imitation, still is it not the very model which has been fulfilled in others in every age since the New Testament was written? You will ask me in whom? I am loth to say. I have reason to ask you to be honest and candid; for so it is, as if from consciousness of the fact, and dislike to have it urged upon us, we and our forefathers have been accustomed to scorn and ridicule these faithful, obedient persons, and, in our Saviour's words, to "cast out their *name* as evil, for the Son of Man's sake." But, if the truth must be spoken, what are the humble monk, and the holy nun, and other regulars, as they are called, but Christians after the very pattern given us in Scripture? What have they done but this—perpetuate in the world the Christianity of the Bible? Did our Saviour come on earth suddenly, as He one day will visit it, in whom would He see the features of the Christians whom He and the Apostles left behind them, but in them? Who but these give up home and friends, wealth and ease, good name and liberty of will, for the kingdom of Heaven? Where shall we find the image of S. Paul, or S. Peter, or S. John, or of Mary the mother of Mark, or of Philip's daughter, but in those who, whether they remain in

seclusion or are sent over the earth, have calm faces and sweet plaintive voices, and spare frames and gentle manners, and hearts weaned from the world, and will subdued—and for their meekness meet with insult, and for their purity with slander, and for their gravity with suspicion, and for their courage with cruelty, and yet meet with Christ everywhere—Christ their all-sufficient, everlasting portion, to make up to them, both here and hereafter, all they suffer, all they dare, for His Name's sake ? *

It is this very consideration which almost deprives us of hope that as our religious become known the prejudice against them will wholly wear away. No doubt it is in a great measure founded upon a misunderstanding of their real character; and so far as it is so it will disappear as that real character becomes known. But, unhappily, it is not wholly founded upon any mistake. In a great degree it is founded on an instinctive and well-grounded feeling :—"They are grievous unto us even to behold, for their lives are not like other men's, their ways are very different." Whatever benefits the world may feel that it derives from them, there is upon them a mark which it hates—the likeness of Him who "came unto His own and His own received Him not." To do all we can to remove the prejudices of education is a plain duty. But when we have done all, a cause of hostility deeper than that will still remain. "Ye shall be hated of all men for My name's sake."

Unquestionably both these causes are at work on the great multitude of those upon whose support Mr. Newdegate and his fellows but too reasonably count in their attacks on our religious houses. And those upon whom they thus count are the constituents of our members of Parliament, and even more, they are the wire-pullers who have the chief share in determining the course taken by each constituency. Here is the simple explanation of the late outbreak. This is the real reason why Mr. Gladstone was compelled, against his will, to consent to the appointment of a committee. He made no secret of his reluctance. He declared his regret for the vote to which the House had come, and his conviction that "serious evil, ill-will, and animosity is likely to result from these proceedings, rather than any solid and substantial good." He declared that he and his colleagues were "not responsible for them, and did not hesitate to record their vote against them"; he protested that Mr. Newdegate had made out no *primâ facie* case for inquiry. "But supposing there should be such an inquiry, will the honourable member himself say that it would be tolerable and endurable for a moment that ladies—or I would rather say women—de-

* J. H. Newman, Sermons on Subjects of the Day, Sermon xvi.

voting themselves to purposes of religion, are to be summoned against their will, by the orders of a chairman of the Committee of this House—(cheers)—and to have the feelings of their hearts, the principles, motives, and ends of their actions, the habits and rules of their lives, made the subject of investigation by examination and cross-examination, repeated one after the other, at the pleasure of those who administer it? I cannot think for one moment that it would be possible, even if a *primâ facie* case were made out, to consent to permit women to be dragged before such a tribunal. The case of the men bears a somewhat different aspect; but I think my honourable friend the member for Stroud* has shown sufficiently that it would be an unprofitable inquiry to ask these gentlemen to give evidence which would criminate themselves, and expose them to prosecution." He then proposed what he was willing to offer, as the alternative to Mr. Newdegate's proposal. "If the honourable member were disposed to accept an inquiry into all matters connected with the property of those bodies, and the state of the law concerning them—while not myself believing that much good is likely to arise from it—my colleagues and myself think that we should pay that respect to the judgment of the House indicated in its first division, which would lead us not to oppose inquiry." What this me ans from such a manas Mr. Gladstone, in such a position as his, there can be no doubt. It means that, deeply as he feels the mischief of Mr. Newdegate's

* It would be unjust not to add that Mr. Winterbotham's speech was not only able, but most manly and courageous, especially considering that he is elected by the Dissenters of Stroud, who are, we believe, to a man eager for the persecution of Catholics. As reported in the *Times*, he appears to have spoken very contemptuously of the Catholic religion. But he has disavowed this report, and declares that the *Stroud Journal*, which contains no expression capable of such an interpretation, gives the only true report of what he said. Mr. Winterbotham's manly conduct receives a foil from that of his colleague, Mr. Dickinson, who, though a member of the Establishment, came in on the same interest, and professed the most liberal opinions, and who zealously enlisted himself in Mr. Newdegate's crew. We would take this opportunity of entreating all Catholics to obtain and keep correct lists of the divisions on this affair, that on Mr. Newdegate's original motion on March 29th, and that of May 2nd, in which 171 members, including pairs, voted against Mr. Gladstone's proposal to discharge the order for his committee. It will do great good if, as the next general election draws near, every one of these gentlemen should find that all Catholics are firmly resolved to vote and canvass for any candidate, of whatever political party, who may stand in opposition to him. For our own part, we feel that it is not as a Catholic merely, but as an Englishman and a gentleman, that every elector is bound to do his utmost to relieve the legislature of his country from the disgrace of having so many members who, for the sake of gaining a political advantage, are ready to make an unmanly attack upon the reputation and personal comfort of a set of unoffending women.

proceedings, and anxious as he is to disclaim all responsibility for them, he cannot (as he glady would) throw them overboard with avowed contempt, because so large a proportion of his own firmest supporters hold their seats at the pleasure of men vehemently desirous to persecute Catholics, and would therefore be afraid to support him (whatever may be their own personal feelings and wishes), that he could not have reckoned upon a majority against Mr. Disraeli and his supporters, who were zealous in pressing for Mr. Newdegate's proposals, strengthened as they must have been for the time by all these timid Liberals.

That it was with real pain that he took this course cannot be doubted. The great glory of his administration has been to treat Ireland as England and Scotland have hitherto been treated. His great object was, first, to do justice, and next to call forth in Ireland a cordial feeling of unity with the other two countries, such as has long existed between Scotland and England. Should he succeed in this attempt, no one of any party will doubt that he will have been a greater benefactor to his country than any politician for some two centuries past. That there is every chance of his succeeding is, we think, evident, and we may venture to mention, as one augury of that success, the publication of a pamphlet, of which we are the only persons whom it would not become to speak as it deserves, because it first appeared as an article in our Review.* One thing only is likely to mar his efforts; that one thing is, if it should turn out to be the case, as many keen-sighted judges believe, that the mass of English Protestants regard the Catholic religion with a hatred so fanatical and violent that they will persistently refuse to make any real and equal union with a Catholic nation. Whether or not this will ultimately prove to be the case, God only knows. For ourselves, we are hopeful; but thoughtful men cannot fail to see that, at this moment, the experiment is being tried, upon the result of which depends the question whether or not the British Islands are to become one united empire. The *Spectator* very truly says:—

> It seems not a little unfortunate that the attempt of a ministry, which avows a thorough-going political sympathy with Ireland, to reconcile that unhappy country with England and Scotland, should have been contemporaneous with one of those anti-Catholic panics to which England has always been liable, though they seem to grow milder after each period of intermission.

---

* "Is Ireland Irreconcilable?" By John Cashel Hoey. Together with "Why is Ireland Poor and Discontented?" By the Hon. Gavan Duffy. Burns. 1870.

It attributes the present fit of the disease to

> The Œcumenical Council and the discussion of the dogma of Papal Infallibility, which have, with even less cause [than the so-called "Papal aggression" of 1850] and with something of almost mysterious agency, given rise to the thrill of anti-Catholic panic, which has spread through England in 1870. One would say that English Protestants really dread, far more than they despise, the Papal system, to note how every step frightens Protestants out of their self-possession, and causes the reiteration of those too familiar hysterical cries, whereof only religious bodies under the fear of Rome, and hares in the final moment when the hounds are just upon them, seem to be capable. Unquestionably it is unfortunate that the discussion of matters more or less involving the religion of Ireland and the attitude of her leading prelates, should have taken place at a time, when Englishmen are suffering from one of their periodical fits of religious hysteria, though the fit may be said to be a comparatively mild one.

Whatever may be the result of Mr. Gladstone's measures, one thing is already plain. It is a singular happiness, both to himself and to our country, that the moment came exactly when it did which offered him the opportunity of making his open, avowed, hearty, manly, and courageous attempt to do full and complete justice to Ireland, instead of that half justice which alone (as he so truly and so manfully declared) had hitherto been offered to her, and which he declared it to be to her honour to have refused. Had Mr. Disraeli continued in office only a few months longer, it might have appeared that England had been driven to do justice to Ireland by the bursting out of a great European war, into which there was great probability of her being drawn, whether she would or not. Thank God, this cannot now be imagined; and under God we may thank that brave and just man, who, in the midst of profound peace and prosperity, offered this as the question to be decided by the people of England at the last general election: Shall Ireland be dealt with as a nation which has no rational ground of complaint, but is discontented merely because of the dulness of its existence on "the confines of a melancholy ocean," or as a nation hitherto discontented because it has been unjustly governed, and which can and ought to be pacified only by extending to it those principles of justice by which other nations are made content? The present dispute, indeed, is not about a question exclusively Irish. Justice would still demand fair treatment for the Catholics of England even if Ireland had no concern in the matter. But her concern is great and intimate. No Irishman can believe that his nation is henceforth to rank on equal terms with the other two if the religion with which it is identified is to be vexatiously and tyrannically interfered

with, even in the neighbouring isle. More than this. A very large portion, we imagine more than half of the nuns whom Mr. Newdegate is longing to harass, are Irishwomen, although members of communities settled in England. Englishmen, certainly, will be the last to admit the principle, that the protection of the fatherland ceases to be one of the rights of a person who settles in another country. Clearly, therefore, the English people must make up its mind to one of two things—either to treat Catholics in England with the same justice which it extends to the members of other religions, or else to abandon the hope of making the union of the British Isles real and effective.

The meaning, then, of Mr. Gladstone's compromise is plain. He believed that he had hit upon a plan which, while conceding to Mr. Newdegate, at least, in appearance, just enough to enable his own followers to vote with him without endangering their elections by outraging the strongest prejudice of their constituents, would not imply any intolerable injustice or outrage towards Catholics. On the whole, he effected his object. There is, indeed, solid ground for complaint in what has actually taken place in the Committee; but this seems to be because Mr. Villiers, the chairman, failed in firmness, and allowed Mr. Newdegate's hatred to overflow the limits which Mr. Gladstone's motion had laid down. This failure on the part of the chairman in his plain duty was a weakness by which we cannot doubt Mr. Gladstone must have been greatly annoyed, although, after all, its effects have not been very serious.

The Committee has sat on fourteen days. Of the two last, the greater part was occupied in an inquiry into the Protestant sisterhoods at Clewer, &c. On the whole, the evidence, so far as it concerns Catholics at all, may be classed under three heads. Several well-informed lawyers expressed their opinions on the question, what the existing laws affecting convents and monasteries really are. Evidence was also given as to the number of religious, both of men and women, in England and Scotland, and as to the amount of property held by, or for the benefit of, such communities. These subjects were within the scope allowed by Mr. Gladstone's motion. But a considerable portion of the Committee's time was consumed in hearing evidence upon subjects wholly irrelevant to its objects, but with regard to which Mr. Newdegate was allowed blindly to feel about, in the hope of coming somewhere or other upon a little dirt which he might throw at the Catholic Church and its religious communities—a hope which, by the blessing of God, has been wholly disappointed.

That his own feelings should have been far from pleasant, and his temper by no means sweet, is anything but wonderful.

For some weeks he had been living in the immediate expectation of a delight which would reward him for years of toil, and thousands of nights in which he had made himself supremely ridiculous and contemptible. He had fancied himself armed with all the powers of a Chairman of Committee, and able to call before him, to question and cross-question, every religious in Great Britain. There could be no subject so insulting, so indecent, so outrageous, that he might not reasonably hope to be allowed to torture these hateful women (who dare to devote their lives to God in a religion whose very name stirs his spleen) by a minute public cross-examination upon it. His tool, Murphy, had only been able to sow broadcast among the people obscene and revolting calumnies against the nuns. He could not help feeling that they themselves would never hear, much less imagine, the filth which he poured forth. It would be reserved for himself to compel them not only to listen to details of impurity loathsome to the ears of every modest woman, but to answer every question upon the subject which his polluted imagination could suggest. And just at the moment when joys like these seemed assuredly within his reach, they were suddenly snatched from him by Mr. Gladstone's relentless hand, and he has had to sit for fourteen days in a hot committee-room, without the pleasure of baiting and insulting so much as one Catholic lady. As a keen sportsman, he no doubt would describe the contrast between what he hoped and what he experienced, by the case of a man who has spent his whole day in hopelessly beating cover to regain the trace of a fox which was already miles away, compared with the joyous excitement of full cry. No wonder he was eager to indemnify himself by bringing up anything, however irrelevant to the object of the Committee, so that he seemed likely to blacken a Catholic priest. The wonder is, not that he should wish, but that he should have been allowed to do this. Yet so it was, that a large part of the time of the Committee on the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh days was wasted in hearing Mr. Newdegate rake up every old charge which has been made in the course of the last twenty years against any member of the Oratory. If this were not a grave injustice, it would still be utterly ridiculous. The Oratorians are, in Catholic language, a congregation of secular clerks living in community; that is, they are nothing more than a party of Catholic gentlemen, priests, or else aspiring to the priesthood, who occupy one house, each retaining full power to leave it any day he pleases. Thus, even while they remain Oratorians, they differ fundamentally from regulars. Regulars, of course, may, if they please, break their rule

and leave their religious house (as Père Hyacinthe lately did); that is, if they chose to do so, there is no law by which their act can be prevented and punished. But every Catholic knows that a regular who should do so would commit a grievous sin. Protestants in general seem to find it difficult to understand this. It is hard to see why; for it must be admitted by all who believe that the world is governed by Almighty God, that there are very many sins against Him of which human laws do not take cognizance—many, moreover, of which it is not possible, many more of which it is not expedient that they should. The case of the Oratorians, however, is widely different. An Oratorian may come deliberately and conscientiously to the conviction that it is the will of God that he should leave the Oratory; and if he does so he is at full liberty to act on that conviction, without obtaining a permission or dispensation from any authority, and no Catholic, even if he thought him mistaken, would presume to say that he had done anything wrong. If he leaves it, not having taken holy orders, he has full liberty to marry. If he is bound to celibacy, it is not because he is an Oratorian, but because he is a priest. Not only so, but even while he remains a member, his position is wholly unlike that of a regular, because he retains, not only the legal possession of his property, but the full right of using it as he thinks fit, without doing wrong. He can also acquire property by inheritance, or by his own exertions, *e.g.*, as an author, and whatever he acquires is his own. He can give his property to whom he will while he lives, and leave it to whom he will when he dies. All this is expressed to Catholics when we say that regulars have taken the three vows of obedience, celibacy, and poverty, while Oratorians are free. Nothing can be more evident than that a committee appointed to inquire into the laws affecting conventual and monastic establishments, and into their property, has no more right to collect and inquire into stories about such a body as the Oratorians than to collect scandal against the Protestant clergy of London and their wives and children. Accordingly, when, on the sixth day of the committee's sittings, Mr. Newdegate called Mr. Smee to detail everything he ever suspected to the discredit of the Oratorians, Mr. O'Reilly objected. Mr. Newdegate said he "wished to ask questions about the property of the Oratorians at Brompton, and that he would afterwards give evidence that they are an order." The chairman seems to have allowed him to proceed, and Mr. Smee gave an account of his own notions and suspicions as to the relations of his late brother-in-law, the Rev. W. Hutchinson, towards the Oratory. The case lay in a nutshell. Father

Hutchinson left the mass of his property to his friend Father Faber, and some to another friend, Father Knox. Mr. Smee not unnaturally felt that he would have preferred to have it himself. He tried at law to set the will aside, and failed. He was allowed to detail before this Committee all his suspicions (which had been already disproved on oath in a court of law), for instance, that an Oratorian is not free to do what he will with his property, but is obliged to leave it to the Oratory. The accuracy of this gentleman is shown by his saying that Father Hutchinson used to visit him in "a robe; he thinks it was white, but is not certain." But he was allowed to declare that although some members of the community swore before the court that they were not bound by monastic vows, he did not believe them, and had had thoughts of indicting one of them for perjury. "He has no doubt that they are a monastic order; his relative considered he was bound to give up his property to the Oratory," and a good deal more of the same sort. Another person was allowed to give evidence that he had been a member of the congregation of the Oratory, and also of the "Little Oratory;" that he considered the Oratorians a monastic body; that when he was admitted he made a promise of obedience; and that they had a house at Sydenham, where they were sent for punishment and a severe discipline; also that he left the Oratory and became a Protestant because something was proposed about a member of his family, to which he objected in conscience; and Mr. Newdegate asked, with an air of profound mystery, "Should you still do the same if the same proposal were made?" on which he said, "Certainly." On cross-examination it appeared that when this man said he was "a member of the congregation of the Oratory," he meant only that at one time he used to attend mass at the church; and he was forced to admit that he did not know what "the rules of the Oratorians" are, nor yet what "monastic vows" are. We happen to know, moreover, that the fathers of the Oratory say they can prove by the books of the Little Oratory that he never was a member of it at all.

Several other stories which Mr. Newdegate had heard against the Oratorians were discussed, much in the same spirit. No one who heard the evidence and his examination could doubt that he thought there was a great mystery of iniquity to be unravelled if only he was allowed to get the clue. But the real lesson was, how monstrously unjust any such inquisitorial inquiry must of necessity be, if conducted before a committee of the House of Commons, which is not bound by the usual laws of evidence, and before which the witnesses are not on oath. We have no suspicion that Mr. Newdegate intended to

urge any charge which he did not himself believe; but he has evidently been for years picking up all the stories and suspicions he could lay hold of, and now brings it all out together, his mind not being so constituted as to observe the distinction between idle gossip and evidence.

No man could listen to one day's evidence without deeply feeling how enormous would have been the injustice and outrage if Mr. Newdegate and the *Times* had been allowed to have the inquiry for which they asked, and how much we owe to Mr. Gladstone and the majority who joined with him to refuse it. There is not one of Murphy's foul and obscene suspicions against the morality of convents which may not quite as truly be called "evidence" as the tales and suspicions retailed by Mr. Smee, Macdermot, &c., against the Oratorians. It is certain that we should have had all that mass of filth retailed, by persons whom Mr. Newdegate was ready to bring before his committee, and that he would have called the nuns themselves to be cross-questioned by himself about it. Such an outrage surely was never offered to Christ's virgins since the days when the heathen persecutors discovered that they could torment them more keenly by insults to their modesty than even by racks and fire. As it was, things were bad enough. Insult was heaped, not indeed upon women, but upon English gentlemen, whose only offence is that they have renounced the pleasures and ambitions of the world, to devote themselves, not merely to the service of God, but to labour among the neglected masses of the poorest of our city population, such as we saw it to be in a book which we lately had occasion to bring before our readers.* If these gentlemen, who live on their own property (for the offertory is said not to pay the expenses of the Church) had only chosen to spend it on their own pleasures, instead of devoting themselves and their property to the good of others, every gentleman in the House of Commons would indignantly have repudiated the idea of making a scrutiny into their private life and their expenditure, so long as they did nothing of which the law could lay hold. Because they are guilty of working and spending and being spent for the moral and religious welfare of London, therefore, Mr. Newdegate was allowed for many days, day after day, to drag them before a committee of the House of Commons, to retail against them every suspicion that unsworn witnesses dared to suggest, and all this we presume (unless the Committee have the firmness to expurgate the disgraceful calumnies to which they were condemned to listen)

* See Greenwood's "Seven Curses of London," and the article in our last number, on "Protestant London."

is to be printed at the public expense, and circulated through the land, so that every future Murphy may be able to recommend it to the belief of ignorant listeners, by showing that it has been "printed by order of the House of Commons."

And the body whose daily private life was thus turned inside out was one with which the Committee was not authorised to interfere at all; and these witnesses were called, ostensibly not to prove anything against the Oratorians, but only to show that they belonged to the class about which it was empowered to inquire. Once more we ask, what limit would there have been to the calumnies that would have been collected and detailed, the questions that would have been asked, and the filth that would have been published, if Mr. Newdegate and his Committee had been allowed to meddle with the convents at all?

We should like to ask what the expense of Mr. Newdegate's hobby has actually been,—the expense, we mean, not to himself, but to us, the taxpayers? Witnesses were called from every corner of the country to prove the most frivolous matters,—at what valuation such a convent is rated,—whether this or that ignorant fellow believes some of his neighbours who live in a certain house to be a monastic order,—and what not. All these witnesses, of course, had to be paid for their time,—for their expenses in London hotels, while waiting, we know not how long, to give their "evidence,"—and for their journeys to and from London.

As for the positive results of the Committee they may be stated in a few lines. All the world knows that Catholic institutions and Catholic charities were in times past suppressed by persecuting laws of extreme injustice and oppression. But it was proved before the Committee, by unimpeachable Protestant evidence, that they are still most unjustly affected by the remnant of those laws still unrepealed. For instance, Mr. Hobhouse, Q.C., Charity Commissioner, said that—

> The trustees of Catholic charities have indeed a difficulty in bringing their charities under the operation of the Commission. Witness considers that it arises from the opinion (whether true or otherwise) that some of the trusts might be illegal. The hesitation on the part of Roman Catholics is very natural. They were excepted from the Act 6 & 7 Vict. It takes a long time to eradicate old feelings. A burnt child dreads the fire. As to the illegality of Roman Catholic trusts, witness has not had experience, either as a barrister or a commissioner. Many lawyers do think that trusts for monastic purposes are illegal. Witness is not prepared to say that this opinion is right. . . . If the commissioners knew that trusts were illegal in deeds brought before them they would not act. Witness has not attentively studied the law relating to monastic institutions. The law respecting

monastic and conventual institutions requires to be revised. Roman Catholics have been subjected since the Reformation to many disabilities. It is true that many have been altered. It would require much study to show to what extent they have been repealed. The hesitation of Roman Catholics to come under the action of the Charity Commissioners is connected with this. All religions ought to be equally brought under the influence of the Charity Commissioners. It would be most desirable with this view to remove any disabilities which prevent such a course. Some disabilities which exist are vexatious, and ought to be removed. It would be wiser that there should be no difference as to the law of uses. As to praying for the dead being deemed a "superstitious use," witness would prefer that all the laws on that subject should be abolished, and that nothing should be legally deemed superstitious which does not violate the law of the land. . . . How far a bequest to secular priests is illegal he has some doubts. A case would be submitted before anything was done by the commissioners in such a state of circumstances.

As the blue book containing the evidence is not yet printed, we have quoted from the *Tablet*, and in some instances the writer of this article has given an account of what was said in evidence, from having himself been present. All condensed accounts give a very unfair and inaccurate impression of the nature of such evidence, chiefly because the question being suppressed, the answer often seems to come in *apropos* of nothing. Mr. Hobhouse, for instance, after saying that he wished the law which declares prayer for the dead to be repealed, adds:— "Witness would not sanction legacies to a society of Thugs, though in the eyes of some that is a species of religion. Though witness does not agree with those who pray for the dead, still, as that violates no law, it ought to be a matter of perfect liberty." The writer was not present when Mr. Hobhouse gave his evidence, but he has little doubt that when the blue book is printed it will appear that he did not himself introduce the comparison between the Thugs and Catholics who pray for the souls of the departed, but that this was one of Mr. Newdegate's delicate little turns, and that he suggested that if Mr. Hobhouse's suggestion were adopted, the murders of the Thugs must be legalized as well as prayers for the dead.

We have quoted a good deal from Mr. Hobhouse's evidence because it shows how inconvenient the existing state of the law is felt to be by Protestant lawyers, who are anxious only to prevent jobs and abuses by which charitable endowments are diverted from their proper object. Several Catholic lawyers were examined. They all agree that the position of all Catholic foundations is unsafe, that men being professed members of religious orders are liable to banishment by the Emancipation Act of 1829. Nuns are not included under that

provision, but it is believed that the establishment of convents is still illegal under older Acts not yet fully repealed. It is illegal to give or leave money for "superstitious uses," and prayers for the faithful departed are held to be a "superstitious use." What the Catholic lawyers demand is, not that convents and monasteries should be made corporate bodies capable of holding property, suing and being sued, but that all laws with regard to them should be repealed, the effect of which would be that such communities would henceforth be regarded by the law merely as individuals living together, the law taking no cognisance of the fact that they chose to be subject to certain rules.

Should any Protestant object that unless something is done to prevent or limit it, property will accumulate in the hands of trustees for the support of religious houses, so that at length the whole soil of the island may be possessed by them, we may remark that that danger, alarming as it may be, is at least sufficiently remote. Mr. Harting (who is more likely than any one else to be correctly informed) gives evidence that the land now held for the use of nuns "amounts to 2 roods 34 perches for each nun," and he adds that if the whole soil of the island were equally divided among the whole population, each person would have about one acre and three-quarters; that is, each nun actually has a little more than a quarter of what she would have if the whole island were equally divided among all its inhabitants. A Protestant newspaper,* commenting on the first day's evidence, said, "Practically the law does not prevent the accumulation of wealth in Roman Catholic monasteries. It only prevents Protestants from knowing how vast are the sums bequeathed to them." This vague suspicion of the "vast wealth" possessed by Catholic institutions in England contrasts curiously enough with their extreme poverty, as proved by the evidence of really well-informed and trustworthy men; and the jealousy by which such estimates are dictated contrasts, if possible, still more curiously with the conduct of English Protestants towards the Protestant Episcopal communion in Ireland. Strikingly opposite as that body is in most respects to the Catholic Church in England, there is one respect in which they are alike, for each represents a small minority surrounded by an overwhelming majority of an opposite religion. The minority in Ireland, indeed, comprises nearly the whole wealth, and especially the landed property of the nation; while the minority in England consists almost exclusively of the poorest of the poor; and yet Parliament

* The *Echo*, May 26th.

unanimously voted to the Irish minority half a million sterling as compensation for the endowments which may have been made by private benefactors within the last 200 years, without even demanding any proof that they approached that sum; and although reminded by Mr. Gladstone, who made the proposal, that in fact those endowments were intended, not so much for the Protestant Episcopal sect as for the National Establishment, and that on this ground many endowments have actually been made by persons who did not themselves hold the doctrines of the sect now disestablished. It is in this spirit that the Parliament and the press of Great Britain deal with the Protestant minority in Ireland; nor, for our parts, do we grudge it. But we do complain of the striking contrast in their spirit the moment attention is turned towards the voluntary benefactions of private persons made (not two centuries ago, but in our own lifetime) to the religion of the Catholic minority in England. Instead of regarding them as so sacred that their application to the purpose intended by the donors must be scrupulously secured, even at the risk of sacrificing a great principle of extreme national importance, there is instantly displayed a morbid terror at the "vast wealth" so devoted, even when it is not nearly enough to supply to the women for whose maintenance it was given (women generally of delicate and often of luxurious training) the ordinary food of a peasant. Thousands are ready to demand that laws should be passed, not to secure the application of these funds to the purposes for which they were given, but to divert them from it, and especially to prevent any future endowments for the same objects. This is what most English Protestants think fair and equal dealing.

And yet, however much remains of the old anti-Catholic feeling, there are strong symptoms that any inquiry into the laws against the Catholic religion which still exist will be sure to compel even the most bigoted to abandon the defence of anything so disgraceful. For instance, on this subject, the same paper which we have just quoted, and which was one of Mr. Newdegate's strongest supporters, speaks as follows in discussing the laws denouncing prayers for the faithful departed as superstitious:—"Justice and expedience alike compel us to urge that no revision of the existing law of monastic property shall perpetuate the insulting spirit of the old legislation. Monasteries may or may not hereafter be authorized to hold property, and the tenure on which they may hold it will be limited as may seem best; but the absurdity of rendering legally invalid bequests for 'superstitious uses,' must at least be abolished . . . For one portion of the community to presume to stigmatise the belief in the efficacy [of prayers for the

dead] as 'superstitious' is a relic of the insolence of past ages of domination." It must grate strangely on Mr. Newdegate's soul to feel that it is the inquiry demanded by himself which has led to the formation and expression of opinions like this. One circumstance, indeed, he cannot but feel to be a triumph to him; it is that the Committee, instead of bringing its sittings to a close, has adjourned, to resume them next session. Thus Catholic institutions are still kept subject to a permanent inquisition, more resembling that system of inspection which he desires to establish than is at all just or fair. Meanwhile he, and such as he, are continually on the watch for any scandal, any quarrel in the Catholic body; or, on the other hand, for any popular excitement, any political change, which may give him the opportunity of inflicting a wound upon us. This is a state of uncertainty and insecurity to which, as peaceable British subjects, minding our own business, we ought not to be exposed. Until the Committee has made its report we cannot feel secure from his attacks. If (as we have every reason to expect) that report, when it appears, is framed in a just and fair spirit, such as Mr. Gladstone no doubt wishes, and if Parliament legislates in the same spirit, the result of Mr. Newdegate's movement will be all that Catholics desire, namely, that the law will place them for the future on terms of equality with their fellow-subjects—without injustice and without favour.

ART. II.—F. LOPEZ ON THE IRISH TRINITARIANS.

Noticias Historicas de las tres Florentissimas Provincias del celesto Orden de la Santissima Trinidad Redempcion de Cautivos en Inglaterra, Escocia, y Hybernia. Su author el M. R. P. M. Fr. DOMINGO LOPEZ. Madrid: 1714.

THE work whose title is at the head of this article contains information relative to the ecclesiastical history of Ireland which, if authentic, is so important, and its credibility has been so much disputed, that our readers will, we think, be interested in the results of a tolerably careful examination of the subject. On the one hand the author of the article in the DUBLIN REVIEW, April, 1865, evidently considers the statements of

Lopez to be unreliable; on the other, Doctor Moran, in his "Persecutions," quotes Lopez as a trustworthy authority. The Franciscan authoress of the "Illustrated History of Ireland" also quotes Lopez as reliable; but as she has evidently copied from Moran, and does not appear to have examined the book herself, this does not amount to a separate authority. We propose to give our readers a brief analysis of the book itself, and a *résumé* of the most remarkable points as regards its authenticity. The work is divided into nine books and an appendix. The first book gives an account of the first and subsequent Trinitarian foundations in England, Scotland, and Ireland. The second is devoted to the "martyrs of Great Britain (in which he includes Ireland) before the persecution of Henry VIII." The third contains an account of "the martyrs of England in the reign of Henry VIII."; the fourth, those of Ireland; the fifth, those of Scotland in the reign of Elizabeth; the sixth, lives of members of the order celebrated for holiness; the seventh, lives of Trinitarians, natives of Great Britain, who were cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops; the eighth, Trinitarian writers; the ninth, other illustrious Trinitarians. The appendix refers to other provinces of the order.

Now, of these various subjects we are interested principally in those relating to Ireland, but, to judge the book fairly, it is necessary to examine also the other parts; indeed our readers will see presently that they afford the best means of testing its truthfulness.

First, with regard to the list of Irish Trinitarian cardinals, archbishops, and bishops, of whom Lopez enumerates two cardinal-archbishops and one cardinal-bishop, seven archbishops, and eight bishops; in all eighteen. It has been already urged that of all these the names only of two are to be found either in Ware or in any of the documents published by Theiner. This argument by itself, however, is by no means conclusive. Doctor Moran has pointed out that the catalogue of Ware is far from complete, and that he frequently assumes that one bishop, of whom he had discovered some record, lived until the date at which he found mention of another, and that he thus in some instances certainly omitted altogether a bishop who lived in the interval. It is, however, remarkable that no mention whatever should be found either in the documents published by Theiner, or in those discovered by Doctor Moran, or in our secular or ecclesiastical historians, of three cardinals and thirteen other bishops. But if we examine particular cases, the difficulty is much increased. According to Lopez, William Golding or Goold took the Trinitarian habit in the convent of Adare; studied and took the

degree of doctor at Oxford; went to Rome, and was appointed by Innocent IV. theologian at the General Council of Lyons in France, and created cardinal by the same Pope in 1245; was named Archbishop of Dublin by Gregory X. after 1270; died in 1276, and was buried in the Cathedral of Dublin. For these, as for most of his other facts, he refers principally to Figueras's Chronicles of the Trinitarian Order, and the Annals of Father Baronius or Baron,* a Minorite, not the great Theatine.

Now, passing over the strange fact that no mention is to be found in any Irish or English historian of so remarkable a man as he is said to have been, a cardinal,† well known in England, France, and Rome, and Archbishop of Dublin, let us examine the dates a little closely. It appears from Ware that Fulke de Saunford was named Archbishop of Dublin by a Papal Bull on the 30th July, 1256; Ware adds that he died at his manor of Finglas, 6th May, 1271; and he then relates the dispute as to the succession between William de la Corner and Fromund le Brun, the one elected by the Prior and Convent of the Church of the Holy Trinity, the other by the Prior and Convent of the Chapter of S. Patrick, exactly as it is stated in the letter of Pope Nicholas III., dated 1279, given by Theiner. In this letter the Pope gives the history of the see "from the death of Archbishop Fulke," shutting out (as the writer in the DUBLIN points out) all possibility of William Goold having been Archbishop of Dublin, as asserted by Lopez.

But there is a more extraordinary story of a Cardinal Archbishop of Armagh in Lopez, which seems to have escaped the notice of the writer of this article. According to Lopez, Richard Wilton, an Englishman of the convent of Montinduno,

---

* Father Bonaventure Baron was born in Clonmel early in the seventeenth century; he was a nephew of the great Father Luke Wadding. He joined the Franciscan convent of S. Isidore in Rome in 1636, where he spent the remainder of his life, and died in 1696. He wrote many valuable works, and towards the close of his life published at Rome the first volume of the "Annals of the Order of the Most Holy Trinity for the Redemption of Captives," commencing with the year 1198, and carrying it down to 1267. See "Rise and Fall of the Irish Franciscan Monasteries," by Rev. C. P. Mechan. We have not been able to see a copy of Father Baron's work.

† We may here compare a somewhat similar case of alleged omission of any mention of the cardinalitian dignity in the case of another Irishman. Raphael of Volterra says that the celebrated Richard Fitz-Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh, was a cardinal. His name is not to be found in the elaborate catalogue of Panvinio and Ciacconio; and hence the statement of Volterra has been rejected by Ware and others. A writer in the "Irish Ecclestiastical Record" (vol. i. p. 528) however refers to a document in Theiner of 1517 as a proof of the accuracy of Volterra, and says, "We have the weighty authority of an official document drawn up at Rome and accepted by the Holy Father himself, for believing that the see of Armagh was honoured by the Roman

in Kent, and their Provincial of England, was name d by Honorius III. (therefore not later than 1226) Archbishop of Armagh. After having governed that see for some years, he crossed to England, and at the request of the English king was made cardinal by Gregory IX. in 1229, whilst in England. He returned to his bishopric, was subsequently legate to the English king, and died in the discharge of that duty on the 21st December, 1239. It would be passing strange that no mention should be made by any English historian of an English cardinal who had played such an important part in the reign of Henry III., and died when legate from the Pope to that king. But what is certain from our Irish annals is, that Luke Netterville was consecrated Archbishop of Armagh by Stephen Langton, and reached Ireland in 1229, and died, and was, by his own wish, buried at Mellifont in 1227. That same year, Donatus O'Fidabra, Bishop of Clogher, was translated to Armagh, and, according to Ware, died on his return from Rome in 1237. Moreover, it appears from a letter of Gregory IX. in 1233, and one from the same Pope in 1235, both* to the then Archbishop of Armagh, that the latter was not a cardinal. We give only one more instance, but it is a very re-

---

purple in the person of Richard Fitz-Ralph." But is this really so? The document of 1517 (drawn up 150 years after the death of Archbishop Fitz-Ralph) is a report by a person whose name is not given, to whom the Cardinal Vice-Chancellor, engaged with other business, deputed the duty of reporting on the then vacancy of the see of Ardagh. This person examined three Irish witnesses, and on their evidence reports that the see of Ardagh was then vacant, and describes its state; and adds, what had no connection with the business in hand, a slight historical sketch of Ireland, from the time of Pliny; describes the Irish as a nation of barbarians, and adds that their country was adorned by several great men: S. Patrick, S. Cathald, William of Ockham, and "the Cardinal-Archbishop of Armagh, who lived in 1353, and left many works." The Holy Father "accepted" the report as to the then condition of the see of Ardagh, and the filling up of the vacancy, and acted on it; but to say that he in any sense accepted or ratified the historical statements inserted, which had nothing to say to the matter in hand, is certainly erroneous. Can he be claimed as authenticating the statement as to the name of Ireland in the time of Pliny; or that William of Ockham was born in Ireland, and not in the county of Surrey, as Alban Butler says? (See life of S. Bonaventure, July 14.) On the other side we have the fact that Pope Clement III., who made him Archbishop of Armagh, always addressed him as archbishop only (Theiner); and Innocent VI., who succeeded Clement III., and outlived the archbishop in 1358, addresses him as archbishop only, and carefully distinguishes between him and the cardinals. (Theiner, p. 313.) Thus the Popes who were his contemporaries, not only "accepted" the statement that he was an archbishop only, but made it themselves in their official letters; and it is impossible to set against this the chance statement made in a report on another matter one hundred and fifty years after his death.

* Theiner.

markable one. At page 425 Lopez* says that Brother Robert Hervey, a Scotchman, was, in 1306, created by Clement V. Archishop of Dublin, in succession to Richard Ferings, who died that year; that he held that see for three years, and died in 1309. He adds that Figueras, his favourite authority, complains of Sir James Ware for having omitted him in his list of the Archbishops of Dublin; an alleged mistake which Lopez says may have arisen from Ware not enumerating bishops who held their sees only three years: "but," he adds, "it is very certain he held the see." Let us now turn in Theiner to the letters of Pope Clement V., the very Pope by whom Lopez asserts this Scotchman was appointed Archbishop of Dublin. There is first a letter of this Pope, dated 20th October, 1306, reserving to himself the provision of the see of Dublin; then one of the 30th March, 1307, to Richard Havering, "elect of Dublin," and saying "vacante dudum Dublinensi ecclesia per obitum bone memoriæ *Ricardi* Dublinensi Archiepiscopi" (that is Richard Ferings), and narrating the election of Richard Havering; then a letter of 10th July, same year, confirming his election, and giving him two years in which to be consecrated. He was only deacon. Then one of 9th June, 1309, to "Richard elect of Dublin." Then one of 8th October, 1309, granting an indulgence to all the faithful of the diocese of Dublin who should "pray for the soul of John Havering, father of the Archbishop of Dublin." Finally, one stating that Richard Havering resigned the Archbishopric of Dublin on the 21st November, 1310. Robert Hervey, Archbishop of Dublin from 1306 to 1309, is then an imaginary being, invented by Lopez and his colleagues to glorify their order; and the same may reasonably be concluded of all their other unknown cardinals and bishops, since as to none are they more precise and confident in their assertions.

Let us now pass to another part of Lopez's work. In his first book, Lopez gives the life and martyrdom of three Irish Trinitarians, Arthur O'Neal, Fergananimus, and Patrick. O'Neal is there said to have been the second son of the chieftain of that name, and, at the age of twenty, when going to a church near his father's residence in the neighbourhood of Adare, co. Limerick, to make his confession, on passing the Trinitarian Church he entered it. Thus at once we see the great clan of O'Neill in the thirteenth century removed from Ulster to the

* Referring, as he generally does, to "Brother George Innes," John Blakeny de Mundi Ætate, and Figueras's Annals.

extremity of Munster. He is there described as "going to the university," at a date when we know there was no university in Ireland, and returning to Adare to be near his parents! At the age of seventy, together with two young religious, Ferganamus and Patrick, he started to preach the faith to the infidels, and, leaving Adare, bent his steps to the city of Amara, in the kingdom of Prester John, in India. They remained two months in the court of Prester John, and thence proceeded to the court of Babylon, and arriving at the city of Ninive, preached there, and were there burnt to death by order of the king, on the 1st September, 1282. For this astounding narrative Lopez gives as authorities Figueras, Father Baron, and several others, of whom the only Irish writer, before Father Baron, is O'Sullivan, in his "Patriciana Decas." Now O'Sullivan, it is well known, is an utterly untrustworthy authority for the events of history removed from his own time and knowledge; as witness his account of S. Patrick's purgatory. But O'Sullivan is not accountable for the inconsistencies and impossibilities in the account of Lopez. He indeed (lib. 10, cap. 2) gives a short account, amongst other alleged Trinitarian martyrs, of O'Neal and his companions, but does not say anything as to the residence of his father; and for the whole account he refers vaguely to "Vetus Historiæ Monumentum." Evidently O'Sullivan, although repeating these stories, could not trace them to any authentic source.

The next portion of Lopez's work which claims our attention is his account of the different monasteries of the Trinitarian Order, which, according to him, existed in England, Ireland, and Scotland. Let us take the houses in Ireland first; of these Lopez enumerates fifty-seven, many of which are not mentioned by Archdall, Ware, or de Burgo. This fact is however far from being conclusive against Lopez. The ecclesiastical history of Ireland is very imperfect. Ware and Archdall collected their information at a time when every trace of many monasteries may have been lost. But whilst giving full weight to this observation, there still remain difficulties which are almost insurmountable. We may well believe that other writers might find no trace of monasteries which had existed in little-known country districts; but what shall we say of such places as Armagh, Louth, Mullingar, Kildare, Limerick, Cork, Galway, Cashel, Waterford, and Tuam, in all which places Lopez asserts there were large and flourishing monasteries of Trinitarians, of which he gives the history in detail; when we find not the least mention of any one of them is to be found in any of our annalists or in any Irish writer, with the exception of one remarkable passage in O'Sullivan's "Patriciana Decas," to which

we will refer later.* Before we leave this part of the subject it may be well to clear up an ambiguity which has led de Burgo into an error. The Trinitarians were sometimes called in England "Friars of the Cross," or "Crossed Friars," from the red and blue cross on their white habit. But there was another order which had many houses in England and some in Ireland, who were properly called "Crutched or Crossed Friars." They were instituted, or at least reformed, by Gerard, Prior of S. Mary of Bologna, and their rule confirmed by Pope Alexander III., in 1169, the year S. John of Matho, founder of the Trinitarian Order, was born. Their dress was blue and a red cross, whilst, as we have mentioned, the Trinitarian dress was white with a red and blue cross. Nevertheless from the similarity of their familiar designation they were, after the suppression, sometimes confounded with the Trinitarians; and thus de Burgo was led to enumerate, in his "Hibernia Dominicana" (p. 735), as Trinitarian convents several which were in reality houses of Crutched Friars: such were Athy, Ardee, Castle Dermott, Dundalk, Drogheda, and Kilkenny West.

Passing from Ireland to England, the facts are still more remarkable. The records of mediæval England are abundant and accessible: most great towns and many counties have their chroniclers: the country had not been wasted by destructive wars since the Roses: the records of the suppression of monasteries under Henry VIII. are accessible, and Tanner and Dugdale's great work, the Monasticon, contains copious records of every monastery of note in England; nay even monasteries or cells in remote districts are all enumerated, and in very few instances indeed are there any doubts as to the site or existence of a single house. Yet whilst Lopez enumerates forty-five Trinitarian convents in England, and gives their foundation and history in the fullest detail, only four of these are to be found recorded in the Monasticon, whilst seven convents of his Order which did really exist and flourish in England are not so much as named by him. And which are the convents which he declares to have been celebrated, but of which no trace can be found in English history? Those of London, Canterbury, York, Cambridge, Bristol, Lincoln, Norwich!—towns of which we know the history in its minutest details, during all those years, yet out of which we are to suppose every trace of these great Trinitarian houses has been blotted. But other names of imaginary convents are worthy of note, giving a clue to the

* It is worthy of remark that at p. 180 Lopez says that the Trinitarian convent of Dundalk was the only convent there; but it is well known that there were in Dundalk a priory of Canons of S. Augustine and a Franciscan friary.

source of their invention. The greater number are those of well-known English towns or bishoprics, such as Bath, Lincoln, Peterborough; some are names of places celebrated in early English ecclesiastical history, but improbable sites for convents in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, such as Bangor and St. Asaph's; some, as "Conventus Dulemensis," the foundation of which is placed at 1257, are evident mistakes; Dulemensis being evidently intended for Dunelmensis, Durham, where however there was no Trinitarian convent. "Darensis," given as the name of an English convent, is a still wilder adaptation, Darensis being the Latin name of the bishopric of Kildare, and sometimes used by mistake for Deriensis, the bishopric of Derry, both in Ireland. The natural conclusion is that the writer picked out any well-known names that he found, and gave them as the names of convents; and also used any portions of the history of his own or other religious orders that he met with. A detailed examination of some of Lopez's accounts of supposed English convents will illustrate this. Lopez states that there was a convent of Trinitarians in London; that it was situated in Hac Street, in the parish of Leadenhall (there was no such parish, but the name was well known), was founded in 1298, by Ralph Hozier and William Severn, who became Trinitarians. For these statements he refers to his usual string of authorities; he adds, the Trinitarians were called "Crutched" or "Crouched Friars." The truth is there never was a convent of Trinitarians in London, but there was one of "Crutched Friars," a totally different order, as our readers have already seen. It was in Hart Street, near Tower Hill, in the parish of S. Olave, and was founded in 1298, by Ralph Hozier and William Severn, who became friars of S. Cross. The only connection of this house with the Trinitarian Order was, that it was built upon the site of certain tenements purchased from a priory of the Holy Trinity, probably that of Hounslow. The most probable explanation of Lopez's account is that he, or whoever he took it from, found in the Trinitarian annals of the house from which the site of Crutched Friars was bought, an account of the Priory of S. Cross, and took it as a foundation on which to found a tale of a Trinitarian house. Except the foundation, Lopez's history of the imaginary Trinitarian convent bears no resemblance to that of the real S. Cross. He tells how in 1535 some eighty monks of his imaginary convent were hanged, drowned in the river, burnt alive, and otherwise put to death, at the same time as the Carthusians; and his tale is evidently an embroidered version of the fate of the latter.* The prior of the real convent

* Lopez's account of the Carthusians is not quite accurate.

of S. Cross, in Hart Street, Edmund Streetham, subscribed to the king's supremacy on the 17th April, 1534, and his convent was surrendered to the king on 13th November, 1539.* We will examine Lopez's history of the convent of Oxford more at length later; but one point in it may be mentioned here as illustrating how he manufactured fictitious Trinitarian history out of real facts relating to other orders. He says (p. 22, referring to Figueras's Annals) the Trinitarian Priory of Oxford was much augmented in possessions and rents by Thomas Hatfield, Bishop of Durham, in 1518. Fortunately we have most full and ample histories of every event connected with the See of Durham; and thus we learn that in 1290, Prior Holon, with the aid of the Convent of Durham (a Benedictine convent), instituted a house in Oxford for eight Benedictine monks. Bishop Hatfield, who was appointed 1344 and died 1381, enlarged the endowment of this house and made it permanent, appointing that the eight monks should be chosen out of the Benedictine Priory of Durham; † but he neither gave nor left anything to the Trinitarian house of Oxford which, as we shall see later, hardly, if at all, existed in his life.

We will now proceed to examine what is probably the most interesting part of Lopez's work,—his account of the sufferings endured for the faith by members of his order in these countries in the reign of Henry VIII. It is clear that it is not enough to say that those sufferings and those deaths are not now known to have been recorded by other writers of the period. The times were troubled, and the Irish records that have survived are few. But, on the other hand, Lopez is precise, and gives full details. He refers to numerous authorities, and gives places, dates,‡ numbers, and every detail with equal authority. He is therefore either wholly trustworthy, or utterly unworthy of belief. All his facts are true, or none are to be relied on. Now, let us give a brief summary of what he relates. It amounts to this. That between the years 1539 and 1550 upwards of two hundred Trinitarian friars, including one bishop, were put to death in Ireland with every circumstance of cruelty and publicity, in the great towns from Dublin to Cork. At page 96 Lopez gives his authorities. Of these the only Irish

---

* See Dugdale, Tanner, Stowe's London, &c.

† See Surtees's History of Durham.

‡ Dates, however, are never perfect tests. Many contemporary writers narrate facts within their own knowledge, but mistake the *exact* year in which they occur. This remark applies, however, only to a variation of a *few* years. It will not do to suggest that a detailed account, given by Lopez, of events in the reign of Henry VIII., may refer to something that occurred under Cromwell.

ones are Baron and O'Sullivan, in his "Patriciana Decas," published in 1629. We will examine his account a little later; in the mean time let us point out that no mention is made of any one of these events by any other and more nearly contemporary author with whom we are acquainted. The Four Masters speak in general terms of the persecution as most fierce. "They ruined the orders—the possessions and livings of all these were taken up for the king—they broke into the monasteries; they sold their roofs and bells, &c.;" but they do not say that any were put to death, with one exception. They mention the fate of the members of one convent of their own order, under date 1540. "The English in every place throughout Ireland *persecuted* and *banished* the religious orders, and particularly they destroyed the monastery of Monaghan, and beheaded the guardian and a number of the friars."* Is it possible that they would have been ignorant of, or silent regarding, the glorious martyrdom of a Trinitarian bishop, and of the hundreds of Trinitarian fathers massacred in all the great towns of Ireland? In 1619 Doctor Rothe, bishop of Ossory, published his "Processus Martyrialis," in which he professes to give a complete catalogue of all, especially bishops and priests, who had suffered death or imprisonment for the faith. He mentions that he had access to several manuscript catalogues kept during the preceding fifty years; and although he laments that some names may have escaped him, there can be no doubt that his catalogue is substantially complete. But he breathes no word of all the Trinitarian martyrs. The same may be said of the authors of the "Persecutio Hiberniæ," printed in 1619; of Dominick a Rosario, who in his "Relatio Persecutionis Hiberniæ" is equally silent. The Dominican annals contain accounts of all those of their order who suffered death in Ireland, but mention none before the reign of Elizabeth; and, with the one exception of the Franciscan friars of the monastery of Monaghan, no religious are known to have suffered before that date. Is it then credible that in those years upwards of two hundred Trinitarians should have suffered death, and no memory of the fact have been preserved amongst us? Further, we have the copious correspondence of the agents of the Reformation and of the English Government with their employers in England during all these years, now published in the "State Papers."

* Probably the exceptional fate of the convent of Monaghan may have been caused by its being an Irish convent in the border land of the Pale, the MacMahon territory; and it may have been destroyed in one of the military expeditions of that period. Most of the Trinitarian convents are said to have been in purely Anglo-Irish towns, as Dublin and Drogheda.

In these we find many allusions to the recusancy and resistance of other bishops and clergy throughout Ireland, and accounts of all the most remarkable events that took place, especially in Dublin; but not one word of the public placarding in Dublin of Catholic theses by the Trinitarians, of their public disputation, of their still more public execution. So much for the negative testimony against; let us now examine the positive testimony in favour of Lopez's account. We have said that the only early work by an Irish writer to which he refers is O'Sullivan's "Patriciana Decas." Now, O'Sullivan's account is very remarkable, and to some extent gives a clue to the difficulty. In this work, which was printed in 1619, in the second chapter of the tenth book, as we have already mentioned, he speaks of the Trinitarians who had preached the Gospel in foreign parts and had been martyred; and refers only to "Vetus Historiæ Monumentum." In the eighth chapter, speaking of the immense number of martyrs and confessors who had suffered under Henry and Elizabeth, he gives as a proof of their great number, "id est argumenti quod unius Richardi Goldæi diligentia de Trinitaris religiosis observavit." He then tells us who this Richard Goold was—"an Irishman from Limerick, a Trinitarian monk, Definitor in the kingdom of Castile, and Professor of Sacred Literature in the university of Alcalá." He then adds these memorable words: "ob id locupletem testem eum judico *penes illum fides esto.*"* O'Sullivan himself, it is plain, had not heard elsewhere of these hundreds of most remarkable martyrdoms. In this same work there is a notable passage, where it would be natural to find them mentioned; but where they are not alluded to. At page 154, enumerating all the evil deeds of Henry VIII., he says, "he slew the bishop of Rochester (Fisher), Sir Thomas More, the Carthusians, and others, both seculars and ecclesiastics." What need was there for him to travel to England to cite the Carthusians as the one instance of religious put to death by Henry, if he believed that king had caused the death of hundreds of Trinitarians in Ireland? Would he not have associated the name of the martyred Trinitarian bishop of Limerick with that of the bishop of Rochester? O'Sullivan further tells us whence Goold professed to have derived his information. "Itaque ut Richardus acceptum a sene

* In 1630, Doctor Arthur, Bishop of Limerick, in a letter to the Holy See, recommended for co-adjutor, amongst others, "R. P. F. Richard Goold familiæ SS. Trinitatis et S. Theol. Professor," then living in Spain; in another letter, a few years later, he is said to be nephew of the martyred Primate Doctor Creagh, and regent of studies in the convent of his order in the university of Alcalá. (See "Irish Ecclesiastical Record," vol. ii. p. 358.)

religioso habebat—ubi primum Henrici edicta." And at the end he adds, "Hæc patris Richardi Goldæi auctoritate secutus scribere putavi, eadem monumentis Trinitariorum Parisiis observata feruntur." The original authorities, then, as far as O'Sullivan knew, were the writings of Father Richard Goold, about 1620, founded on what he had been told by an old monk, whose name is not given; and a report (feruntur) that the same facts were to be found in the Trinitarian records at Paris. We have said that O'Sullivan's account of Father Goold's writings puts us on the track of the origin of Lopez's history of the persecutions, because he gives, in an abridged form, as derived from Goold, all that Lopez narrates, and sums up the number put to death, according to Goold, as at Dublin 50, Adare 50, Galway 20, Drogheda 40, Limerick 50, Cork and Kilmallock 90; besides many others. O'Sullivan, after giving the account of the Trinitarian martyrs of the reign of Henry VIII., on the authority, as he is careful to say, of Father Goold, proceeds to give many other instances of martyrs, referring for each to various authorities, chiefly his own collections; but all these (with the one well-known exception of Doctor John Travers) are from the reign of Elizabeth, the earliest date being 1577, the latest 1622. Clearly, then, O'Sullivan's own researches had not enabled him to find any corroboration of the narrative of Father Goold. We will now proceed to examine a little the internal evidence of authenticity afforded by the history of Lopez. As has been already remarked, if minuteness and accuracy of detail be a proof—and it is undoubtedly a *primâ facie* proof—of truth, Lopez's account abundantly affords it. The minutest details are given, the discourses of the actors, the mode of death, the exact date. But, on the other hand, if these details are improbable or impossible, the whole tale of which they form a part must fall with them. We will first give Lopez's account of the fate of the convent of Dublin. According to him, in February, 1539, in consequence of the intention on the part of the Government of enforcing the new edicts touching the king's supremacy, the Provincial of the Trinitarians assembled in Dublin many prelates and doctors of Oxford and Cambridge of his order. They determined to post up theses in defence of the Pope's authority, signed by eight doctors. On the 24th February the ministers arrived in Dublin with the edicts, and the next day the Trinitarian theses were posted up. The ministers of the king, enraged at this, killed the Father Provincial in the streets by a musket-shot; suddenly seized Father Theobald, and without any trial put him up on an extempore scaffold, made in the streets, of tables and planks, and, stripping him to the waist, an executioner was sent for,

who split him open from the shoulder down with an axe, and cut out his heart. All the other fathers were put to death in like manner, without any trial; some being hanged, some slain with the sword, some stoned to death. All this occurred on the 25th and 26th of February, 1539. The only point in which the narrative is confirmed by other histories is the fact that in 1539 a commission to carry into effect the Act for the suppression of monasteries was issued. This, and the similar statement in O'Sullivan, taken from F. R. Goold, that this occurred "ubi primum Henrici edicta," &c., leaves no doubt that the occurrence either happened in this year or not at all. Our readers can judge how far it is credible that all we have given from Lopez occurred in the capital of Ireland in this year, and yet that no other writer should have heard of it, especially the Four Masters, who under this year give many occurrences of far less moment, and in the next year record the death of their own friars in Monaghan. The times, no doubt, were troublous, but the forms of law were observed, at least in the capital; yet we are to believe that some fifty priests were, without any form of trial, put to death in violent and unheard-of ways in the streets of Dublin; and no trace of it was left in any correspondence of the period. One passage in Father Goold's narrative in O'Sullivan (which is evidently the prototype of Lopez), is worthy of remark. He says that one of these fathers was tortured by having his legs fastened in leather boots and set fire to (exactly as was done to Archbishop O'Hurley in 1584). Now, we know from the correspondence of the Lords Justices with the Privy Council, that this mode of torture was unknown in Ireland before 1584; and that they got those instruments of torture from England in that year. Was not, then, its application to the Trinitarian father a fable derived from a knowledge of the history of Archbishop O'Hurley?

The next case we propose to examine is that of Limerick. The following is Lopez's narrative. Cornelius O'Neill, a Trinitarian and a doctor of Oxford, was bishop of Limerick,* and had been so for some years, when he was consulted as to Henry's divorce, and gave his opinion in favour of Catherine, which angered the king, who thereupon ceased to correspond with

* The learned writer of the "History of the Archbishops of Dublin," p. 25, calls him "Suffragan or Coadjutor Bishop of Limerick," but he does not give any authority for the statement. Lopez calls him simply Bishop of Limerick, and utterly ignores the real Bishop of Limerick, Doctor Coyne, who, we learn from "Shirley's Original Letters," p. 47, was even in 1550, although old and blind, the zealous opponent of the new doctrines. Would he, eleven years before, have left it to another to oppose the innovators?

him; he must therefore have been bishop before 1580. In June, 1539, the Royal Commissioners came to Limerick. On the feast of S. John the bishop preached in the cathedral against the royal supremacy; the Commissioners feared to lay hands on him on account of the people, and let him return to his palace; but *at one o'clock in the day, when, on account of the heat, all were retired into their houses,** certain ministers took an executioner with them, and going to the bishop, summoned him to obey the king or die, and on his refusal the executioner cut off his head: they then went to the monastery, and hanged or cut to pieces all the rest of the monks.

Now, it is quite certain that Doctor John Coyne,† a Dominican, was appointed bishop of Limerick in 1521, and held the see until 1557, twelve years after the events we are now discussing, when, being old and blind, he resigned; but in 1550, although blind, he was, as we have seen, the intrepid defender of the faith and an insuperable obstacle to the innovators. How is it to be accounted for, then, that nine years before, if we are to believe Lopez, he left the defence of the faith to his coadjutor, and was left unmolested by the persecutors? And how came it that, being deprived of this coadjutor, whom we are to suppose he needed, when comparatively young, he was for twelve years longer able to administer the see without assistance?

We will not detain our readers by giving in detail Lopez's account of the fate of other monasteries, but will briefly enumerate a few of the most striking facts which, if we are to credit him, we must believe. Whilst all contemporary writers, both English and Irish, describe the people as wedded to the old faith, and the English agents of the Reformation deplore the fact, and say that they dare not proceed to extremities against those who adhered to the old religion for fear of the people, Lopez describes the Trinitarian fathers in several places as falling victims, on account of their orthodoxy, to the fury of

---

* Doctor Moran (Hist. Archbish. Dublin, vol. i. p. 26) translates this passage, "sought him in the evening of that day;" but in the original the words are as we have given them. They are very suggestive of a tale concocted in Spain, where such an incident would be natural.

† It is curious that whilst Lopez invents a bishop of Limerick in 1539, called Cornelius O'Neill, there really was a bishop of Limerick of that name, who ruled the see from 1581 to 1597. The same thing constantly occurs; the names of Lopez's heroes and of the place of their sufferings occur in other undoubtedly historical accounts. See for instance the two Trinitarians said to have been slain at the bridge of Borubristino, and compare it with other events that occurred there.—(See Major O'Reilly's "Memorials of those who suffered in Ireland.")

the populace. At Adare, he says, the ministers of the king and the justices persuaded the people to call for punishment on the monks, and they were accompanied to the convent by a great crowd, who aided in killing the monks.* At Kilkenny the people were roused against them, broke into the convent, cut all the monks to pieces, and burnt their bodies. At Drogheda all the people were on the side of the heretics, and all the monks were, with their help, hanged, or cut to pieces, or thrown into a well. Those who remember the devoted attachment of the Irish people of that day to the Catholic religion and its ministers will be slow to believe the stories of which these are parts. We may here add a few of the most remarkable stories of martyrdom narrated by Lopez. At Galway, in 1545, certain heretics went out to shoot sparrows, and went to lunch at the convent, began to dispute with the father minister, and then took him and tied him to a tree and shot him, and killed all the monks. The heretics who would so act in Catholic Galway in 1545 must have had very little regard for their own safety. In Kilmallock a monk was tied to four horses and torn to pieces. At Cork the father minister had his tongue cut out and was burned alive on the public square—all the rest were hanged. At Kildare the judge lighted a great fire in the square, and first put out the monks' eyes and cut off their ears, and then threw them all into the fire. At Armagh the Trinitarians were all burned publicly in the market square. At Dundalk they were dragged at the tails of horses until dead. These are but a few examples of the way in which it is alleged that upwards of 300 of these monks were publicly put to death without trial, between the years 1539 and 1547.

But if it be impossible that these marvellous events should have occurred in Ireland, and left no trace in history, the case is much stronger as regards England. All that occurred in England at the change of religion under Henry VIII. is well known. Catholic writers, such as Cardinal Pole and Saunders,

* It is, on the contrary, very probable that the Trinitarians of Adare, far from being all slain in 1539, managed, although despoiled of almost all their lands, to retain possession of the convent itself, and some small appurtenances, until later than 1559. A survey of the manor of Adare, taken in that year, says, "There standeth on the south side of the said town an abbey of friars, who have a cross of blue and red upon their breasts, as the minister thereof did show, which hath in Castle Robert twenty-three small acres, &c.; the said minister hath in Adare a great acre, with certain gardens, a water-mill, a salmon wear, and paieth yearly 8*s.* 8*d.*" It was not uncommon at this period for those who obtained grants of abbey lands to conciliate the goodwill of the people by leaving the monks in possession of some small part. In 1567, however, Queen Elizabeth gave the house (the Trinitarian Priory) to Sir Warham St. Leger.—"Manor of Adare," by the Earl of Dunraven.

wrote to publish to the world all the cruelties inflicted on Catholics; they did not conceal or extenuate the crimes of the king; Lopez himself refers to them as almost his only English authorities; but not one word of all he relates with regard to the Trinitarian fathers is to be found in their pages, nor even a reference to anything of the sort.* And what is it that he says happened in England between the years 1535 and 1538, and yet left no trace in contemporary English history? The violent destruction of more than fifty convents, many of them burnt to the ground, and their inmates in them, by armed violence; the slaughter (in most cases without any form of trial) of upwards of 400 monks. And Cardinal Pole and the other English writers who narrate at length the trial and death of Sir Thomas More, and Bishop Fisher, and of the Carthusians, whose death by a straining of the law cost Cromwell so much trouble, never thought it worth while to say a word of those whom Cromwell put to death at the same time and place without any form of trial whatever.

To let our readers judge of the utter improbability of the narrative, we will give a brief *résumé* of some small portion of it. It is well known, how, in April, 1535, the priors of the three Charter-houses of London, Axholm, and Belleval, were tried for high treason in denying the king's supremacy, and with five others were executed. After relating these events with some inaccuracies, Lopez goes on to say that the Trinitarian fathers, by whose convent they passed on their way to execution, encouraged them; and for this were, by Cromwell's order, after some parleying, seized in their convent, and two, the father minister and another, beheaded the same day, the 17th of May; the others were thrown into prison. On the 19th

---

* To those who know how careful and painstaking the historian Dodd and his editor, Tierney, were, it will appear almost conclusive that no reference whatever to Lopez's narrative is to be found in his pages; and this not from ignorance, for Dodd enumerates Lopez's work as one he had seen and examined. In the appendix he gives a list of persons executed in Henry VIII.'s reign for opposing the king's spiritual supremacy, but mentions no member of the Trinitarian order. ("Church History of England," by Dodd, edited by Tierney.) It is true that, after the rebellion of Aske in the north, subsequent to the suppression of the monasteries, the abbots of Fountains, Rivers, and the prior of Bridlington were executed on a charge of high treason; and the religious of Salley, Whalley, Norton, and Hexham, who had been restored to their houses by the insurgents, were ordered to be executed by martial law; so also we have recorded the fate of the Carthusians and of the abbots of Reading, Colchester, and Glastonbury, &c.; but not one mention of the alleged hundreds of Trinitarians. (See Dodd's "Church History," vol. i. pp. 264 and 283, and Appendix; also Collier and Stevens's Monasticon.)

four were hanged; on the 21st ten were taken to the Thames, and, weights being tied round their necks, were drowned; on the 30th ten were burned alive; the 3rd of June five were hanged by the arms over a slow fire and so burnt to death. And for this tale, which Pole does not mention, we are referred to him and to a MS. said to have been left in Douai by Father James Burgess, O.S.T., and another MS. of Father John of S. Francis, O.S.T. Whether these MSS. ever existed or not will probably never now be ascertained. The tale told of the fate of the London convent (which, as we have seen, never existed) is a type of that told of all the fifty English convents.

At Norwich* Cromwell sent a visitor named Hortumnus to the Trinitarian convent, which was outside the town, and contained thirty priests and lay brothers; they refused to open the doors, and Hortumnus ordered fire to be set to the house, and it was burned with all its inmates. At Ingham Cromwell's commissary, Rodulph, came with an armed mob, and slew in the church with swords and stones all the religious, in number eighty-five; this was in 1535. In 1537, a commissary named Henry, a relative of Cromwell's, went to Cambridge, and put forty-two Trinitarians to death in their convent. The doctors were sent to the Tower of London, with many other doctors of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. One day Cromwell ordered them all to be put to death, without any trial, with various torments, and their bodies to be burned; and three Trinitarians were torn to pieces by horses in the streets of London! Is it not passing strange that Oxford and Cambridge should know nothing of all these their alumni? The tale of all the other convents is the same, but it may be worth while to give that of Oxford, as in this case we can compare the imaginary tale of Lopez with the real facts, as found in contemporary documents. According to Lopez, in 1535, the University of Oxford having pronounced against the divorce,†

---

* Lopez does not give many English Trinitarian bishops (he gives a great many Scotch), but one case which he does give, relating to Norwich, is fatal as to his claim to be believed. He gives, with specious detail, the life of Peter of Montinduno, a Trinitarian monk, who was made Bishop of Norwich by Honorius VII., at the nomination of Henry III., and died in 1234. Now we know with perfect accuracy the bishops of Norwich, and there was no such man. In 1200 John Grey was made bishop, and was afterwards Lord Chief Justice; he was succeeded in 1222 by Pandulph, the Pope's legate; and he, in 1226, by Thomas de Blundeville, who lived until 1236, and was succeeded by Bishop Radulphus.—See "History and Antiquities of Norwich," by Rev. C. Parkins. London: 1783.

† This was not the fact. The only decision on the point by the university was one (obtained by fraud) in Henry's favour. See note in Lingard. This

Henry sent Cromwell to Oxford. He first threw all the doctors into prison, and then had them brought before him, and on the refusal of one, Father Thomas Marsilius, a Trinitarian, and a native of Oxford, to take the oath of supremacy, ordered him then and there to be hanged and quartered, which was done. A lay brother having gone to Cromwell's lodgings and upbraided him, was by him ordered to be slain in his presence, which was done, and he then sent 200 men to the convent, who cut to pieces all the religious. Now let us see what is the true history of this convent. Lopez's account of its foundation is correct, and the copy he gives of a charter of Edmund Duke of Cornwall accurate; so that he had access to some true account, from which he took his start; but from that date not a word is true. We have already shown the falsehood of the tale about Bishop Hatfield. Far from the house having become constantly more flourishing, and its inmates more numerous, the following are the facts. The house was founded in 1240; in 1321 all the monks were carried off by an epidemic, and the lands escheated to the king. After several years the father minister of Hounslow sent a single friar there to perform divine service. Later their house merged into an inn, called Trinity Hall. Wood adds, "As to the dissolution I know nothing certain concerning it, as not finding it among the monasteries destroyed by Henry VIII., and I am led to believe that the name of an hall, by which it was known, occasioned its being slipped by. However, that was when the other brotherhoods were overturned. John Amery, of the order of the Holy Trinity, was principal there, and at the same time, according to ancient custom, the stipend drawn from the colleges of Oxford, maintained certain poor scholars there, where a certain old priest or anchorite dwelt. Lastly, about the latter end of the reign of Henry VIII., Robert Perrot, Batchelor of Musick, was principal there, and at that time, if I mistake not, he having the house and chapel let to him by the citizens, demolished them, and built there a barn, a stable, and a hogstie."*

A few more instances of the falsehood of Lopez's account of the suppression of English monasteries may be given. At p. 114 Lopez gives a long tale how Cromwell himself came to Canterbury and caused all the Trinitarians to be hanged. We have, however, the original letter of Richard Devereux, who

---

shows the writer must have been a person wholly ignorant of the facts of English history of the period; for Henry's partisans constantly boasted of the decisions of the two English universities in their favour.

* See Stevens's "History of Monasteries," and Wood's "Antiquities of Oxford."

was the visitor sent to suppress the monasteries at Canterbury. He wrote, "I came to Canterbury, where I find four houses more in debt than they shall be able to pay, and especially the Austin Friars; the Black and Gray friars be able to pay their debts and little more." He says nothing of the imaginary convent of Trinitarians, and mentions as the only one who opposed him an Augustinian friar, who disputed with him, and upheld the Pope's supremacy, and whom he sent in charge of a man to *Cromwell* to deal with him: "and so I will make an end of Canterbury."*

Lopez gives the visitation of Cambridge by "Henry, a relation of Cromwell," and the martyrdom of the Trinitarians and many others there (p. 105). The real visitors were Doctor Thomas Legh and John ap Rees, and in a letter to Cromwell they give a full account of their visitation and of all the convents there, but not a word of the Trinitarians. (Ellis, p. 117.)

At Hounslow the Trinitarians were all put to death with barbarous tortures, according to Lopez (p. 119). But the visitor, Dr. Layton, wrote to the Lord Privy Seal, "The minister of the Trinitarians of Hounslow has, on the 25th September, made a lease to a gentleman of all the house and lands for 100 years." (Ellis, p. 224.) The tale Lopez tells of Tellisford is harrowing; how many even seculars took refuge from the persecutors in the Trinitarian church, and all the monks were either garotted or hanged throughout the town. The real history is given by John London in a letter to Lord Cromwell, narrating his "rasing of the friars' houses in various countries." "At Tellisford Crosse Friars I have only received the surrender, and left the house with all the stuff in safe custody with the late minister and one of the king's servants dwelling therein." (Ellis, p. 130.) Lopez puts the "martyrdom of the friars of Berwick" (which he places in Scotland) at the 19th June, 1559. But we learn that all the monasteries in Berwick surrendered freely to Richard Devereux, visitor for King Henry of England, some twenty years before. (Ellis, p. 186.) The same Richard Devereux was visitor of Huntingdon, Boston, Lincoln, Carlisle, and Lancaster, and his emphatic silence negatives Lopez's account of Trinitarian convents in these places. (Ellis, p. 179.)

Thus it is clear that in the case of the suppression of the English monasteries, where the accounts given by Lopez can be fairly tested, they are found to be utterly devoid of foundation.

The conclusion, then, which it seems we may fairly arrive at is,

---

* Ellis's "Original Letters," Third Series, p. 179.

that the greater part of the statements in Lopez which can be tested are absolutely untrue; and that, consequently, none of his accounts can be relied on, unless supported by other and better evidence. Another and more interesting, but far more difficult question, remains. To whom are we to attribute the forgeries? This is a question which, with our present means of information, we are unable to answer, but which deserves careful examination. Lopez's work was published in 1714, Father Baron's about 1690; and, as we have seen, Lopez refers to him. Father Baron's annals, however, only came down to 1267; therefore, if even he gives the tales relating to the early foundations, he cannot be accountable for the stories about the martyrs of the reigns of Henry and Elizabeth. So, also, Figueras, who published at the end of the seventeenth century, and is referred to with respect by Alban Butler, probably only copied them from others. The tales of the alleged Irish martyrs of the reign of Henry VIII. are, as we have seen, traced back through O'Sullivan to Father Goold, who appears to have written them in Spain about 1620. Whether he deceived or was deceived by "the aged monk" will probably never be ascertained, any more than who was the real author of the other various MSS. referred to by Lopez. A careful examination of the writers referred to by Lopez, whose works, although not to be found in this country, may still exist in the Spanish and Italian libraries, would do much to clear up this strange tale.

We will conclude by remarking that although it is painful to think that such a mass of false history should be traceable to Catholic writers like Lopez and his authorities, a tolerably extensive acquaintance with the Catholic historians of Ireland of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries enables the writer of this article to state that, with the exception of some wild chapters in the "Patriciana Decas" referring to early history, these Trinitarian histories are the only ones to which the charges of falsification and invention appear justly applicable.

ART. III.—THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

The Catholic Church in America. By THADDEUS J. BUTLER, D.D. Chicago. 1869.
A Brief Sketch of the History of the Catholic Church in the Island of New York. By the Rev. J. R. BAYLEY. 1853.
The Puritan Commonwealth. By PETER OLIVER. Boston. 1866.
The Early History of Maryland. By RICHARD MCSHERRY, M.D. 1869.
The Protestant Episcopal Church. New York. 1868.
United States Catholic Directory. New York. 1869.

THERE is a critical moment in the life of all political and religious corporations, during which they are commonly said to be "on their trial." Such moments, as various records concur in attesting, are apt to prove fatal to institutions of human origin. The earth is strewed with the wreck of things which once were, but now are not. And their number increases continually. No contrivance of human ingenuity can rise higher than its source, nor prove stronger than its constitutive principle. And therefore states, governments, and churches decay or disappear, one after another. The apparent exceptions only prove the rule. Islamism and the Oriental sects still survive, but they survive only as petrifactions. They have antiquity, but not life. There are fossils of reptiles which are much older, and quite as useful. Other products of like origin prolong their existence for a time by changing their form. The English Constitution, which some fondly deemed the most enduring of human inventions, exists in our day only by being subjected to incessant modification. The English National Church ceased long ago to be national, if it ever was so, in anything but the name. It tends visibly to dissolution, and is doomed, if we may believe its own prophets, to prompt extinction. And so inevitable is this collapse of all human structures, that when such unstable fabrics finally break in pieces their downfall excites no surprise. The very people who had found a temporary and precarious shelter within their walls marvel only that they should have lasted so long. Their materials were so slight, and their foundations so rotten. That the crash would come, sooner or later, was the one thing which, at any moment of their existence, might have been confidently predicted of them.

Like the meaner creations of purely human origin, the Church of God is always on her trial; but, unlike them, nothing harms her. The trial passes away, and she is found to be exactly what she was before. No "burning fiery furnace" is fierce enough to consume so much as the skirt of her garments, nor will "the smell of fire pass on" her.* She has lasted so long, in spite of all that a thousand Nabuchodonosors, ancient or modern, could do against her, that even her enemies now feel sure that she will last to the end. Nor does she bear the least resemblance, as they perceive, to a fossilized body. In her radiant old age she retains the vigour and pliancy of her immortal youth. Whatever she did in bygone times, she is able to do now, and is doing it before our eyes. She is still equal to every emergency. Even now, as an adversary whom we shall have to notice presently, observes, she is "able to revive the magic of the apostolic age." She is never weary, and never faint. She is so assured of her indefectible security, that no provocation, however brutal and senseless, can make her angry. Her serenity is like the serenity of God. When the mighty of this world threaten her, she smiles; when they revile, she blesses; when they persecute, she prays for them. Their madness does not alarm her, for she knows that, in the long run, it will be fatal only to themselves. She has buried all their predecessors, during many succeeding generations, and will bury them in their turn. The earth is covered with the ruins of meaner things, but where are the ruins of the Church?

S. Augustine once observed, that the faithful of his age had fuller evidence of the divinity of the Church than the contemporaries of the Apostles, because the latter could only look forward to the promises, while the former could already look back upon their fulfilment. The proofs have accumulated since his day. In every age and nation they have multiplied, until we have reason to ask with surprise, how any professing Christian can remain yet unconvinced? If *they* were outcasts and reproved who failed to recognize their Creator in the Carpenter's Son, though the disguise was so impenetrable that no mortal could detect or confess His Divinity "*but by the Holy Ghost,*"† what shall we think of those who cannot distinguish between the true Church, with her history of nearly two thousand years, and the palpable counterfeits which simulate her voice and mimic her gait? Will any one seriously affirm that it is harder to recognize her than it was to recognize Him?

---

* Daniel iii. † 1 Cor. xii. 3.

It is, in truth, by the same Divine impulse that men are able to recognize either. The one is mirrored in the other; and the reflected image is so like the true one! Like Him, she has confounded and put to silence all her enemies. Like Him, she has spoken as never man spoke. Like Him, she has been lifted up and has drawn all men to her. Like Him, she can descend into Hades and release captive souls. Like Him, and because of her union with Him, death has no power over her. All that He predicted of her has come to pass. It was foretold that the gates of hell should not prevail against her; and that while all who fall upon her should be "broken to pieces," upon whomsoever she should fall she would "grind him to powder." Has either prophecy been falsified? And now, in our own age, a new proof of her divinity is given to the world, to which it is time to call attention. After repeating in all the lands of the *old* world that almost incredible victory which her first Apostles won, and during which the Cross was carried in triumph through a sea of blood from Jerusalem to Rome, and the pagan Cæsar finally supplanted by the Fisherman, a *new* world has been discovered, and a new nation formed, out of elements gathered from all the races of men, as if to show once more, that in every form of human society, and under all possible conditions of human thought, whatever God has made she can rule, whatever God has called she can attract, whatever God has lost she can recover. She is only doing now in America what she had done already everywhere else. The Jew, blinded by prejudice and national conceit, was her first conquest; the Greek, thirsting only after natural beauty, was her second; the Roman, who tolerated all religions because he cared for none, was her third. And even of Jews, Greeks, and Romans she was able to make saints and martyrs. After so astonishing a victory nothing could be difficult to her. The Barbarians, who came to destroy, knelt before her Pontiffs to ask their blessing, and were incorporated into Catholic nations. And then her Apostles went forth from Rome to conquer by turns, with better fortune than Cæsar, and more enduring results, Gaul, Spain, Germany, and England. Her bishops, as even a Guizot confesses, created Christian Europe. To her we owe all that distinguishes our civilization from that of the ancient Romans or modern Chinese; and whatever the kingdoms which have fallen away from her in later times still possess of truth, liberty, and life, is but the meagre residuum of that incomparable treasure which she once bestowed upon them, and which they have rashly squandered. And now, in our own epoch, she has to deal with a new world; a world which is neither Greek,

Roman, nor Barbarian, but a medley and *colluvies* of all that other regions and peoples could supply; a world which sprang up in a day, without an ancestry and without traditions; whose inhabitants have neither unity of origin, of language, nor of sentiment; and who have imported to their new home every error which ever existed in the old, as well as some which had found no place in it, with the addition of all the grotesque varieties which individual caprice and universal licence could add to the original stock. In this singular community, unique in its composition, and compounded of the fragments of every European social stratum except the highest, but destined perhaps to attain one day the unity already possessed by more homogeneous races, and certainly destined to acquire a power which will be felt from pole to pole, the Church, knowing that she can deal with man, and captivate his love, in whatever conditions he may be placed, and whatever resistance he may oppose, has begun her accustomed work. She has been long enough engaged in it to enable us to estimate with sufficient precision the results already obtained. They are peaceful in their nature and silent in their operation, but they will exert a wider and more enduring influence on the destinies of the great American Republic than such tumultuous but ephemeral incidents as now agitate the kingdoms of the old world. The progress of the Church, and the diffusion of the divine gifts which she alone can dispense, are of deeper moment to a fallen race than even the march of armies or the fate of thrones.

In every land which she has hitherto redeemed from the darkness of error to the supernatural light of truth, she has had to contend with some or all of the formidable influences by which the enemy seeks to isolate man from his Creator, and to perpetuate his dismal exile. In America, as everywhere else, her difficulty has been to persuade the gross to prefer what is pure, and the sordid to love what is generous; to make the self-willed docile, and the effeminate valiant; to substitute the spiritual for the material, concord for division, obedience for lawlessness, and the realities of eternal truth for the phantoms and illusions of heresy or unbelief. But in the new world she has encountered, in addition to all the familiar evils of the old, a special difficulty and impediment, which threatened for a time to oppose an insuperable barrier to her progress. In that region of the United States which extends from the river St. John, in New Brunswick, to the shores of the Hudson, and from the Atlantic to the Canadian frontier,—a region to which has been given the name of New England,—a race distinguished by well-known characteristics from every

other section of the American people has found a home. The first colonists of the New England States, wild as Ismael and impetuous as Jehu, enemies especially of the Catholic religion, but hardly less intolerant of every other form of religious opinion differing from their own, succeeded in impressing upon their descendants a peculiar type both of moral and intellectual character, not yet effaced, and which has failed to attract sympathy even in America. In the race which has sprung from their loins men notice, with rare individual exceptions, a singular development of the lower intellectual faculties, attended by insatiable avidity and conspicuous success in the pursuit of material aims. Perhaps the description given by the late Mr. Buckle of the working of a spurious theocracy in Scotland affords the most exact reproduction which any section of European society has hitherto presented of the results produced by a kindred system in New England. If an educated inhabitant of New York, Cincinnati, Baltimore, or New Orleans, accustomed to the contemplation of the same social and intellectual models as those which claim admiration in the older societies of Europe, and wisely resolved to recognize no meaner types, were asked what is the chief staple of humanity in the towns and villages of New England, he would probably give some such account as the following. The "Yankees," he would say, resemble foxes rather than eagles. Meanly solicitous about mean things, they are cunning but not wise; acute, but not large-minded; busy, vigilant, and indefatigable, but generally with a sordid and always with a selfish aim. Skilled beyond all their contemporaries in inventing ingenious machines, but by preference such as pare apples or peel onions, they are themselves only machines for making money, which they amass without dignity and expend without taste. Restless and incapable of repose, because they have no resources in themselves, and do not even comprehend the life of literary ease or intellectual meditation to which nobler natures aspire, and which in all European communities is the ideal both of the merchant and the artist, who consent to a period of toil in the hope of attaining it, these men despise the leisure which they would not know how to employ, and arrive at extreme old age without having quitted the factory or the counting-house, where alone they have found a semblance of contentment, and beyond which all is for them unknown, unprofitable, and unappraised. Traders in politics, their remunerative patriotism consists in regarding the State as a bank in which they claim to be the only shareholders, and in imposing upon their fellow-countrymen a fiscal system ingeniously contrived to oppress every other interest to the exclusive profit of

their own. Traders in religion, they calculate the market value of religious profession, and can be profuse without charity, fanatical without emotion, and polemical without a creed; and while a vast number no longer have, nor profess to have, any religion whatever, the rest either satisfy the temperate cravings of their spiritual appetite with the dry husks of Socinianism, or find a sufficient resemblance to Christianity in some eccentric sect among whose members faith is only an intermittent sensation, the preacher's voice the solitary sacrament, and in which the august mysteries of Revelation are all reduced to *one* of a lower order—the mystery that such a form of religion should exist, and that any one should be found to profess it.

It was to this rude and unpromising soil that the Church, going forth as a sower to sow her seed, and accustomed for many centuries to difficult husbandry, committed without fear the plant of divine faith. Nowhere on the American Continent has the old conflict between truth and error, between the Church and the sects, been more fertile in instructive or consoling incidents; and in attempting a sketch, necessarily brief and superficial, of the progress of that conflict and of its memorable issue, we cannot select a more convenient starting-point than the historical region in which heresy was constrained to reveal both its malignant spirit and its incurable impotence, while the Church, as an American Protestant observes, "revived the magic of the apostolic age," employing agents so heroic and means so divine that the same writer asks: "Can we wonder that Rome succeeded, and that Geneva failed?"* When we have glanced at the history of New England, we shall notice the same contrast between the temper and the operations of the Church and of Anglicanism, in New York, Maryland, and Virginia; and, finally, give some account of the work accomplished by the former in the valley of the Mississippi, the cities of the North-West, the plains still peopled by the Indian tribes, and the distant regions of Oregon and California.

An eminent American prelate, the present Archbishop of Baltimore, who has furnished, among other contributions to the literature of his country, an able exposition of the Puritan legislation in New England, observes that this reproach must ever rest upon its framers; that they were "the first who brought the spirit along with the practice of persecution into

---

* "The Puritan Commonwealth," by Peter Oliver, ch. iii., p. 254. (Boston, 1866.)

this country."* The fact is so notorious that, as he adds, their successors, "retaining only their inveterate hatred of Catholicity," have vainly attempted to conceal the evidence which even they feel to be a note of infamy upon American Protestantism. "There has been manifestly a studied effort," observes Archbishop Spalding, and one which he detected during his researches after original documents, "on the part of the descendants of the New England Puritans to cover up and to conceal, as far as was possible, all traces of the very peculiar legislation adopted by their forefathers."† It was only "after very considerable exertions and delay," that his Grace was able to procure copies of two works containing the "Blue Laws of Connecticut," the "Judicial Proceedings of the Newhaven Colony," the laws of the Plymouth or Massachusetts Colony, and other specimens of the original Puritan code of New England. A few extracts from their enactments will suffice to prepare the way for such an account of the actual proceedings of the so-called "Pilgrim Fathers" as our limited space allows, and to justify the verdict which the latest Protestant historian of New England Puritanism pronounces upon it, when he says, with righteous disgust: "*Hating true liberty*, and despising the true rights of the people, it at the same time professed to be the friend of both."‡

Among the laws of Newhaven, adopted by Governor Eaton, and printed in 1656, are the following:—

Every person in this jurisdiction, *according to the mind of God*, shall duly resort and attend worship . . . and if any person, without just cause, absent or withdraw from the same, he shall for every such sinful miscarriage forfeit five shillings.

That none shall be admitted freemen, or free burgesses, within this jurisdiction, or any part of it, but such planters *as are members of some one or other of the approved churches of New England*; nor shall any such be chosen to magistracy, or to carry on any part of civil jurisdiction, or as deputies, or assistants to have power, or vote in establishing laws . . . . nor shall any others, *but some such church members*, have any vote in any such elections, &c., &c.

---

* We must not be understood as implying in the text that Catholic rulers act otherwise than most Christianly in repressing by force the introduction of heresy. But this principle constitutes no defence for the Protestants on whom we are animadverting.

† "Miscellanea: Comprising Reviews, Lectures, and Essays, by M. J. Spalding, D.D., Archbishop of Baltimore, vol. i., p. 355, 4th edition. 1869.

‡ Oliver, ch. vi., p. 486.

Again :—

It is ordered and decreed : That if any Christian (so called) within this jurisdiction shall contemptuously behave himselfe towards the word preached or the messengers thereof, called to dispence the same in any congregation when he doth faithfully execute his service and office therein, *according to the will and mind of God*, either by interrupting him in his preaching, or, by charging him falsely with an error w'h he hath not thought in the open face of the church ; or, like a sonne of Korah, cast upon his true doctrine, or himselfe any reproach, to the dishonour of the Lord Jesus who hath sent him, and to the disparagement of that his holy ordinance, and making God's wayes contemptible and ridiculous, that every such person or persons (whatsoever censure the church may pass) shall for the first scandal be convented and reproved openly by the magistrates at some lecture and bound to their good behaviour. And if a second time they breake forth in like contemptuous carriages, they shall pay either five pounds to the publique treasury, or stand two houres openly upon a block or stoole four foott high upon a lecture day, with a paper fixed on his breast, written with capitalle letters, AN OPEN AND OBSTINATE CONTEMNER OF GOD'S HOLY ORDINANCE, that others may feare and be ashamed of breaking out into the like wickednesse.

The *Plymouth Code* was in harmony, as might be expected, with this beneficent legislation. Here is one of its decrees, promulgated in support of that miserable "sabbath" superstition which seems to have been invented in order to gratify the enormous vanity of human preachers in Scotland and New England, and to condemn their unhappy victims to listen for long hours, whether they liked it or not, to men who knew no more about true Christianity than themselves :—

This court, taking notice of the great abuse and many misdemeanours committed by divers persons, profaneing the sabbath or Lord's Day, to the great dishonour of God, reproach of religion, and grief of the spirit of God's people, Do, therefore, order, that whosoever shall profane the Lord's Day, by doing unnecessary servile work, by unnecessary travailing, or by sports and recreations, he or they that so transgress shall forfeit for every such default forty shillings, *or be publicly whipt ;* but if it clearly appears that sin was proudly, presumptuously, and with a high hand committed, against the known command and authority of the blessed God, such a person therein despising and reproaching the Lord SHALL BE PUT TO DEATH, or grievously punished at the discretion of the court.

The colonies of Hartford and Newhaven were governed by such edicts as the following, which formed part of the statute law, devised by merciless and self-adoring preachers, in those favoured provinces :—

21. No one shall run on the Sabbath day, or walk in his garden, or elsewhere, except reverently *to and from meeting.*

22. No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair, or shave on the Sabbath day.

23. *No woman shall kiss her child* on the Sabbath or fasting day.

Finally, the 38th article of Governor Eaton's code is this :—

If any man *shall kiss his wife*, or *wife her husband on the Lord's Day*, the party in fault shall be punished at the discretion of the court of magistrates.*

It is to be carefully noted that these enactments, which are among the most ludicrous but by no means the most atrocious of Puritan legislation, were the light yoke imposed upon those who *recognized* the authority of the preachers, and enjoyed the privileges of their unselfish and paternal jurisdiction. To hear *them*, to obey *them*, to feed *them*, and to live every hour in abject submission to the tortures and vexations which these ingenious persons knew how to inflict "*according to the mind and will of God*," was the agreeable lot of those who actually belonged to "one or other of the approved churches of New England." If these happy Christians chanced to live in any seaport, "where God's providence shall cast any whales," the Blue Laws of Massachusetts admonished them "to set apart some p'te of every such fish or oyle *for the incouragement of an able and godly minister*." And this, as Mr. Oliver remarks, was a natural development of the theory of the Puritan preachers. The earth, they said, and the fulness thereof, belonged to the saints: they were the saints; therefore they possessed the earth, and apparently the sea also, or at least the whales which it happened to cast up for their particular advantage. But if these were their relations to those who obeyed, it may be easily imagined how they dealt with those who denied their authority. Catholics, it need hardly be said, were as carefully excluded from their precincts as snakes or alligators, and were considered quite as fair game. "Priests," says the Connecticut Code, "may be seized by any one *without a warrant*;" and if they were seized, they lived only till the axe was sharpened or the gibbet raised. But it must be admitted that Quakers, Baptists, "witches," and generally every one ill affected towards the "able and godly ministers," whom it was their first duty to reverence, fared no better—unless to be "unmercifully whipped," as Mr. Bancroft

* Archbishop Spalding quotes many other edicts from the printed Puritan codes, some of them almost fiendish in their cruelty, in which we know not whether to admire most the impudence of those who imposed or the imbecility of those who accepted them.

relates, branded with a hot iron, lopped of their ears, or hung up by the neck, while some Puritan preacher "improved" the occasion with an appropriate discourse, could be considered an amelioration of the lot reserved for Catholics. According to the New England Code, "liberty of conscience," as Washington Irving pleasantly said, only meant "that every man should think as he pleased in matters of religion, *provided* he thought *right*." "To say that men ought to have liberty of conscience," was their own declaration, "is impious ignorance,"* a proposition which in men who had left England to enjoy that liberty was at least inconsistent.† "The truth is," said Edmund Burke, "they had *no idea at all of freedom.* The very doctrine of any sort of toleration was so odious to the greater part, that one of the first persecutions set up was against a small party which arose amongst themselves. . . . In short, this people, who in England could not bear being chastised with rods, had no sooner got free from their fetters than they scourged their fellow refugees with scorpions." Here is a description by the same hand of the monstrous condition to which society was reduced by these truculent preachers, of whom "*seventy-seven* were in orders in the Church of England."‡ "*An universal terror and consternation seized upon all.* The prisons were crowded; *people were executed daily;* yet the rage of the accusers was as fresh as ever."§ As Washington Irving satirically observes, "having served a regular apprenticeship in the school of persecution," which the Church of England had taught them, "it behoved them to show that they were proficients in the art." The following extracts from their official codes show how they imitated, if they could not improve upon, the Star Chamber; and how the treatment which Catholics and Dissenters had received in England was applied, with complete impartiality, by the very men who had endured it, to every school of religious dissidents in Massachusetts and Connecticut.

---

* Bancroft, ii., 336.

† Lord Macaulay notices, in the second chapter of his history, a still more curious inconsistency on the part of Anglican Protestants. "Abroad," he observes, "the ambassadors of Elizabeth and James went in state to the very worship which Elizabeth and James persecuted at home. An English prelate," he adds, "if he went to Holland, conformed without scruple to the established religion of Holland." Indeed, it was not till 1661, that "episcopal ordination was, *for the first time*, made an indispensable qualification for church preferment."

‡ Rupp. "Hist. Rel. Denominations," p. 271.

§ "An Account of the European Settlements in America," pp. 151-160. (1758.)

Among the Blue Laws of the latter State is the following: Art. 19. "*No food or lodging* shall be afforded to a Quaker, Adamite, *or other heretic.*" The court assembled at Plymouth in 1657, enacted that whosoever "within this Government" shall knowingly "entertain" any such person, should pay "the penalty of five pounds for every such default, *or be whipt.*" But the following order, passed on the 14th of October in the same year "is surpassed by few documents of the kind," observes the Archbishop of Baltimore, "on record in any country, Christian or Pagan."

As an addition to the late order in reference to the coming or bringing in of the *cursed sect* of the Quakers into this jurisdiction, it is ordered that whosoever shall from henceforth bring, or cause to be brought, directly or indirectly, any known Quaker or Quakers, *or other blasphemous heretiques*, into this jurisdiction, every such person shall forfeit the sum of *one hundred pounds* to the country, and shall by warrant from any magistrate be committed to prison, there to remain till the penalty be satisfied and paid. And if any person or persons within this jurisdiction shall henceforth entertaine and conceal any such Quaker or Quakers, or other blasphemous heretiques, knowing them so to be, every such person shall forfeit to the country *forty shillings for every hour's entertainment* . . . and it is further ordered, that if any Quaker or Quakers shall presume, after they have once suffered what the law requireth, to come into this jurisdiction, every such male Quaker shall for the first offence *have one of his ears cut off*, and be kept at work in the house of correction till he can be sent away at his own charge; and for the second offence shall have *the other ear cut off.* . . . And every woman Quaker that shall presume to come into this jurisdiction *shall be severely whipt.* . . . And for every Quaker, he or she, that shall a third time herein again offend, THEY SHALL HAVE THEIR TONGUES BORED THROUGH WITH A HOT IRON, &c., &c.

Such was the legislation of Puritan New England, and if such an exhibition of Calvinistic ferocity is no longer possible either in Scotland or in Massachusetts, the two regions in which Calvinism has produced its most deadly fruits, this is not because the "able and godly ministers" of those countries have learned the meekness and modesty which their interpretation of the Gospel has made impossible virtues, nor because they have willingly relaxed their insolent domination over the souls whom they are permitted to torment, but solely because public feeling would resent the assumption of magisterial authority by men who have so cruelly abused it. "The Blue Laws have been modified or repealed," says Archbishop Spalding, in his second Essay on the "Union of Church and State."

True; but no thanks are due to the Puritans for the better system of legislation which now obtains in New England. The amelioration was forced on them by circumstances of imperative necessity; by circumstances which it would have been vain in them to have attempted either to resist or to control. . . . The constant influx of European emigration, of persons belonging to all sects, or to no sect, soon left them in the minority, and compelled them to return to more liberal principles. The abrogation of the Blue Laws, we repeat it, was brought about not *by* the Puritans, but *in spite* of the Puritans.*

We are now, perhaps, sufficiently acquainted with the attitude of the New England Puritans towards their fellow-Christians. It remains to speak of their dealings with the aboriginal inhabitants of the land of which, by a singular dispensation of Providence, they were permitted to be the first colonists. When the so-called "Pilgrim Fathers" arrived in America, the Atlantic States swarmed with a vast population of Indians, superior in natural endowments to the savages of any other region of the earth, and capable, as the missionaries of France and Spain have proved, not only of civilization, but of Christian faith and virtue. "How did Puritanism find these red men?" asks the candid historian of the Puritan Commonwealth. "Did they drink? Did they lie? Did they gamble? Did they thieve? Were they licentious in morals or depraved in habits? On the contrary, *the simplicity of their habits attracted the notice of all Europeans.*"† Such was the raw material upon which the "able and godly" Puritan preachers were now to try their skill. Unlike the ferocious barbarians of the southern continent, among whom such a multitude of Catholic missionaries found a speedy death, but who were finally converted in tens of thousands, the Indians of the north appear to have received the white strangers, not only with satisfaction, but even with cordiality. "When you first arrived on our shores," their Sachems could say at a later period to their cruel and treacherous oppressors, "you were destitute of food; we gave you our beans and our corn; we fed you with oysters and fish; and now, for our recompense, you murder our people."‡ It seems as if Providence had purposely left to the agents of Protestantism the easiest task ever proposed to Christian missionaries, in order that the evidence of their incapacity might be more complete and decisive. Even when, in other provinces, they made the attempt to convert the Indians, "a more signal failure than

* "Miscellanea," vol. i., p. 367. † Oliver, ch. ii., p. 193.
‡ Bancroft, ii., 564.

their missions exhibited," says a Protestant historian, "has seldom been recorded."* But the Puritans, who coveted, not the souls, but the lands of the heathen, did not so much as make the attempt. Their only thought was to slay them, and to do it as quickly as possible. "No one," observes Dr. Wilberforce, now Protestant Bishop of Winchester, "had so much as a thought of attempting to convey to the unhappy tribes around them the blessed message of salvation."† "They seized without scruple," adds the same writer, "the lands possessed of old times by the Indians, and it is calculated that upwards of 180,000 of the aboriginal inhabitants were slaughtered by them in Massachusetts Bay and Connecticut alone." And the Puritan ministers actually boasted of crimes which even to their heathen victims appeared prodigious and unexampled. "God do so," wrote Cotton Mather, after a horrible massacre of unoffending natives, "to all the implacable enemies of Christ and of his people in New England."‡ And both he and his fellows, their mouths full of Scripture texts, and surpassing each other in the horrible jargon of their school, represented the Most High God as their complacent ally in acts which would have been considered monstrous by Tartars or Chinese. In Massachusetts, as Mr. Upham remarks, "the Indians were held to be the devil's own children and agents, *whom the saints were in duty bound to exterminate.*"§ So effectually did they do their work, worthy of them and of their religion, that populous tribes, who might have easily been won to Christianity and civilization, were literally "exterminated" by men compared with whom these unhappy Indians were models of kindliness and simplicity. "All the Indian tribes," says M. de Tocqueville, "which formerly inhabited the territory of New England . . . no longer exist but in memory."‖ The Puritan "*system of religion,*" observes Mr. Oliver, "in the short space of fifty years, swept from New England one hundred thousand human beings." A little later none remained; and the Protestant historian of the Puritan Commonwealth, confessing that the spirit of the Puritans still animates those who dare not repeat their acts, though they continue to profess the same doctrines and principles, exclaims: "For these unhappy heathen souls, no Puritan historian, magistrate, or elder, *then or since,* has

* Oliver, ch. iii., p. 244.

† "A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America," by Samuel Wilberforce, ch. iii., p. 82.

‡ Drake, "History of the Indians of North America," book ii., ch. vii.

§ Quoted by McSherry, "The Early History of Maryland," p. 12.

‖ "De la Démocratie en Amérique," t. iii., ch. v., p. 115.

expressed a word of pity, or breathed a penitential prayer. Unregenerate, they were sent into the presence of their dread Judge, owing nothing to Christianity but steel, gunpowder, and gin."*

It would be difficult to estimate more exactly in a few words the sum of the benefits conferred upon the natives by the first Protestant missionaries in America. When they had nearly completed their merciful ministry, and the Indians had become almost as rare as wolves in England, "the Puritan," says Mr. Howitt, "gave at length as much as £100 for every Indian scalp that could be brought to them."† As early as 1675, in the Puritan State of Massachusetts, it was

Ordered by the Court, that whosoever shall shoot off any gun on unnecessarie occasion, or at any game whatsoever, EXCEPT ATT AN INDIAN OR A WOOLFE, shall forfeit five shillings for every such shott, till further libertie shall be given.

And the "able and godly ministers," who presented to the heathen such convincing proofs of the superiority of the Christian religion, varied their pious amusements by sometimes selling them into slavery, when they were tired of killing them. "As long as slavery was profitable," says a well-known American journal, "the Puritans not only enslaved *both the Indians and the Negroes*, making them 'taxable property,' but carried on a brisk traffic in their flesh, selling them in the best markets to the highest bidder."‡ And the "saints" were foremost in this evangelical traffic. Winthrop, one of the most famous, not only claimed large tracts of land, which he pretended to have purchased from the Indians, but bequeathed *Indian slaves* to his heirs in his last will. The celebrated Whitfield, as the Council of New York complained to Governor Clinton in 1746,—for the lapse of time did not change the nature of these men,—"gulled the deluded people," whom he was supposed to evangelize, in a still more exemplary manner.§ And even the better sort, such as Eliot and Mayhew, only excited the scorn of the Indians by the varieties of their doctrine,—so that Ninigret forcibly observed to the latter: "If my people should have a mind to turn Christians, *they could not tell what religion to be of*,"—and taught them to deceive and betray their own people. "Eliot's

---

* Oliver, ch. ii., p. 151.
† "Colonization and Christianity," ch. xx., p. 317.
‡ *New York Herald*, Jan. 20, 1861.
§ "Documentary History of New York," vol. iv., p. 398.

system," observes Mr. Oliver, "was based on a species of treason, which, if he had practised towards the subjects of a civilized nation, would have rendered his life a just forfeit to the laws." And then this New England lawyer adds the following reflection:—"While the Puritan missionaries received salaries which at this day would be considered generous, and never abandoned the comfortable residences of civilization to penetrate the forest, the Roman priest commenced his labour as one of self-denial. Eliot received fifty pounds as missionary, also his salary as minister of his society, besides gratuities from private sources." "The Jesuits may be excused," is the final observation of one whom not even his own confessions could fully enlighten, "for introducing Romanism, where no other European had introduced any thing but the small-pox."*

We have no space for further details, but must not pass to another region without a few words on the actual condition of New England, both as respects the heirs of the Puritans, and the Catholics whom the latter would not suffer to enter, and the former would expel if they could. It is to the *issue* of the combat that we wish to direct attention.

"Infidelity," says an able American writer, "has been cultivated Young America's usual poor recoil *from the Puritanism of its childhood.*"† It is naturally in New England that this instructive fact has been most conspicuously illustrated. The first Anglican Church in Boston became the first Socinian temple in Massachusetts,‡ and it is a curious record of the true origin of New England unbelief that, in many of the Unitarian Churches, "the *liturgy of the Church of England,* expurgated of all passages which infringe upon the Unitarian creed, is regularly said."§ According to the same writer, the Unitarians have 360 churches in New England, "but all is cold and lifeless." Yet the general diffusion of unbelief—now so common, that an American Protestant could report several years ago, that, "not one-half of the adult population even belong to *any* Christian sect"||—does not exclude either fanaticism or superstition. Sir Charles Dilke observes, in 1868, that "the success of spiritualism is amazing," and that "astrology is openly professed as a science." The "dupes of the astrologers," he superfluously adds, "are not the credulous Irish," but men formed in the Puritan mould, "*shrewd and*

---

* Oliver, p. 257.
† Parton, "Life and Times of Aaron Burr," ch. iv., p. 63.
‡ Wilberforce, ch. xii., p. 446.
§ "The Aspects of Religion in the United States of America," p. 69.
|| *New York Churchman,* vol. ix., No. 25.

keen in trade, brave in war, material and cold in faith, but credulous to folly." * He seems surprised at a fact which is as old as religious error, and is its ordinary accompaniment. "Puritanism," says Mr. Oliver, "was eminently superstitious," and its superstitions were either base or ludicrous. "They derided," he adds, "the sign of the Cross, but saw magic in a broomstick." (Ch. vi. 487.) Why not? The heathen have done the same thing in China and Japan.

The Puritanical authoress of "The Englishwoman in America," thus appreciates the co-existence of monstrous fanaticism with cheerless unbelief, produced by the same causes, and displayed by the same race. "It is a singular thing that the New England mind . . . should foster, if not create, some of the wildest extravagances which exist, and some of the most dangerous errors which have been evolved from the book of truth—extravagances which are exerting their sway over thousands in America, bewildering the intellect and perverting the heart; and errors which, multiplied a thousandfold by the press, and gilded by the splendour of intellect and genius, are pouring their pernicious streams wherever the English language is spoken." †

Finally, the historian of the Puritan Commonwealth relates, in the following impressive sentence, the ignominious dethronement of the "able and godly ministers" who, during nearly a century, ruled the Commonwealth for their own temporary advantage and the spiritual ruin of their victims. "Their theology, more voluminous than their history, is now antiquated in the very places where, formerly, its teachings were inculcated by the aid of the scourge and the prison. The sermons of the famous preachers would now excite derision, if preached from the pulpits they formerly occupied. . . . Who can recognize the Puritan of the eighteenth century in the Freethinker of the nineteenth?" ‡

The description which has now been given, by competent witnesses, of the past history and present condition of New England, does not offer much encouragement in approaching the inquiry, from which, however, we may not shrink, into the progress of the Catholic faith in a region so long abandoned to the darkness of error. But the triumphs of the Church, even in the most unpromising fields, can never surprise us. The diocese of Boston is exactly conterminous with the ultra-Puritan State of Massachusetts. Its first bishop, afterwards

---

* "Greater Britain," ch. xvi., p. 166.
† "Aspects of Religion," &c., p. 65.
‡ Oliver, ch. vi., p. 489.

Cardinal Cheverus and Archbishop of Bordeaux, was consecrated in 1810. The diocese contains at this moment about *three hundred and sixty thousand* Catholics. "There are," observes Sir Charles Dilke in 1868, "eighty thousand professing Catholics *in Boston.*"* We learn from the United States Catholic Directory for 1869, that in that city, where once a Catholic would have been roughly handled by the "able and godly ministers," there are, besides the cathedral, now occupied by the fourth Bishop of Boston, *eighteen* Catholic churches, five colleges or academies, seven convents, and ten hospitals or asylums. Yet this is the very city "whose leading citizens," as Mr. Maguire relates, "informed Archbishop Carroll that had they, sometime before his visit, met a Catholic in the street, they would have crossed to the other side, such was their horror of one of that detested creed.† In the single State of Massachusetts, where once a priest was greeted like "an Indian or a woolfe," and might be "seized by any one without a warrant," there are now more than one hundred and seventy priests, who are much esteemed even by their Protestant neighbours, and more than ninety ecclesiastical students.‡

"Massachusetts," observes Dr. Butler, in 1869, now "respects the uncompromising fidelity of the Church to her dogma and her discipline. She has found her Catholic citizens loyal, enterprising, and bold; . . . and she notes with her keen perceptive mind that wherever a Catholic spire crowns a height, *prosperity and good order flow from it.* . . . There is another way, too, in which New England makes reparation. It is by yielding up her sons and daughters to a religion she has once traduced. A nobler band of converts, more hardy in warfare, more unflinching in combat, more ready to look the world straight in the eye and confess the name of Jesus and Him crucified, or more loyal in devotion to His Blessed Mother, cannot be found. The genuine type of the Yankee is to be found, if anywhere, among those *converts* who carry into the very homes of the Puritan the aroma of the Sanctuary." §

We have heard of the "Blue Laws" of Connecticut. That State, together with the little State of Rhode Island, is now included in the Diocese of Hartford. The cathedral city of the see is Providence, in Rhode Island, which contains, besides

---

* "Greater Britain," vol. i., ch. iv., p. 43.

† "The Irish in America," ch. xxviii., p. 535.

‡ A second diocese has just been created in Massachusetts.

§ "The Catholic Church in America," p. 32.

the cathedral, the *five* Catholic churches of S. Patrick, S. Joseph, S. Mary, the Immaculate Conception, and S. Michael, and the two chapels of S. Aloysius and S. Catherine. There are more than ten thousand Catholic *children* in the parochial schools of the diocese, and more than two hundred priests and ecclesiastical students.

The diocese of Portland comprises the two extreme northern States of Maine and New Hampshire. Even in this diocese there are more than fifty thousand Catholics, and four Indian Missions. In the single city of Manchester, in New Hampshire, there are "fourteen public schools attended by Sisters of Mercy." The Sisters of Notre Dame have charge of more than nine hundred girls connected with the cathedral and the church of S. Dominick in the city of Portland. Speaking of Manchester, Mr. Maguire says: "Since the arrival of the Sisters, in 1858, there have been over two hundred and fifty converts instructed by them in the faith, and mostly from the wealthier classes of society."

The diocese of Burlington comprises the State of Vermont. Though only created in 1853, when its bishop, Mgr. de Goesbriand, was consecrated, it already contains more than thirty thousand Catholics.

It appears, therefore, and with this observation we may quit New England, that in the very province where they were once proscribed with such unrelenting ferocity, the Catholics already number more than five hundred thousand. And they will increase henceforth at a still more rapid rate. Owing to causes at which we can barely glance, but which are exposed in all their revolting details in official documents, and have excited general consternation, the native population of New England is dying out. "Already," says Sir Charles Dilke, "of every four births in Boston, one only is American." "Year by year," he continues, "the towns grow more and more intensely Irish." The epitaph of New England Puritanism is written by this impartial witness, when he adds, with mingled astonishment and regret: "*Saxon Protestantism is departing with the Saxons.*"*

---

* Ch. iv., p. 43. It is certainly worthy to be noted that Geneva, the cradle of Puritanism, is passing through the same change. "The reconquest of Geneva seems certain when we hear that its Roman Catholic population, who, even during the French occupation before 1815, numbered barely two thousand five hundred souls, now amounts to over forty-two thousand, while the Protestants of all sorts only muster forty thousand of the whole population of the canton. . . . The Catholic Church is now the only breakwater at Geneva against the utter licence of rationalism." — *Cornhill Magazine*, April, 1866. It is exactly the history of New England.

The same contrast, both as respects measures and results, may be traced in almost every other part of the American Union. Let us briefly examine it in the great State of New York.

As long as this region belonged, like the other Atlantic States, to Great Britain, the conversion of the natives, and the development of Catholic influence, were opposed by means which no other Christian nation would have consented to employ. We know how Catholics were treated in England and Ireland, and it was not likely that they would fare better, under British rule, in America. In 1700, after sending British soldiers to massacre the venerable Sebastian Rasles, and pursuing his apostolic colleagues in every part of the country with a fiendish cruelty worthy of savages, or of New England Puritans, the English authorities passed a law in New York "to hang every Popish priest that should come into the province."* But we must refer to works which treat expressly of this subject for the details which our narrow limits do not permit us to record. The very "last act of British rule in New York, in 1778, as the present Bishop of Newark notices, was to cast the Abbé De la Motte into prison for saying mass.† And then they departed, too late, indeed, to save the native tribes, whom they had already brutalised and destroyed, but not too late for the Church to accomplish among their more generous successors the work of peace and salvation which the English had resisted to the last.

The first Catholic priest ever settled in New York was Father Francis Whelan, an Irish Franciscan, who had been a chaplain in the French fleet of De Grasse, and whose congregation amounted, in 1785, the year before his death, to "about two hundred."‡ There are now, within the same limits, more than two hundred *priests*, but this is to anticipate.

Up to the year 1808, the only diocese in the United States was that of Baltimore. In that year, Pius VII. erected Baltimore into an archiepiscopal see, and founded four suffragan sees, of which New York was one. But this measure had in view rather the wants of the future than of the present. It was not till 1815 that the first cathedral was consecrated, by the celebrated Bishop Cheverus, at that time resident in Boston; and a welcome proof that the Americans understood toleration otherwise than the English authorities whom they

---

* "Documentary History of New York," vol. i., p. 154.

† "Sketch of the History of the Catholic Church in the Island of New York," ch. i., p. 35.

‡ Bayley, ch. ii., p. 42.

had ejected, is found in the fact, that the mayor and aldermen of New York were present at the consecration. The first Bishop of New York was the Dominican, Dr. Concanen, who was consecrated in Rome, but died before he reached the new world. The second bishop, Dr. Connolly, had only four priests in the whole of his vast diocese, and about 17,000 Catholics. In 1818, this prelate lamented that "the American youth have an almost invincible repugnance to the ecclesiastical state." In 1822, he still counted only eight priests in his diocese.*

A single anecdote will show what sort of priests they were, and what life they led. Father Bulger, one of the eight, who was accustomed, like his colleagues, to formidable journeys, almost always performed on foot, in one of his missionary expeditions, "carrying a bundle, containing his vestments and breviary, was overtaken by a farmer and his wife in a waggon." As there was nothing in his costume to indicate his calling, they gave the weary traveller a seat, and continued their way. But in the course of conversation it came out that the wayfarer was a priest, upon which the wife vehemently insisted that he should at once be turned out of the waggon, and left to complete his journey as he could. And this decision, in spite of the feeble remonstrance of the husband, was promptly executed. The hesitating humanity of the farmer seems to have earned for him a blessing, for at a later period Father Bulger had the consolation to receive him into the Church.†

The third Bishop of New York, the holy and venerable Du Bois, was consecrated in 1836, at which date the city already contained 35,000, and the diocese 150,000 Catholics.‡ In 1842, Dr. Hughes became the fourth bishop, and in 1850 the first Archbishop of New York. He died in 1864, and was succeeded by the Most Rev. John McCloskey, translated from the see of Albany, and now second Archbishop of New York.

We have seen that less than fifty years ago, the whole diocese of New York contained only eight priests. That diocese, once equal in size to many European kingdoms, has been gradually reduced to little more than the city and county of New York. The see of Brooklyn, a suburb of New York, was founded in 1853, and comprises Long Island. The city of Brooklyn *alone* now contains, besides its cathedral, *twenty-five* Catholic churches, and there is a daily attendance of 12,000 children in its Catholic schools. Albany, established in 1847, and the capital of the State of New York, has more than 140 priests, and about 240,000 Catholics. Rochester, another see

* Bayley, ch. iii., p. 72. † P. 75. ‡ Ch. iv., p. 91.

formed of certain counties in the State of New York, and only established in 1868, has ten churches in the cathedral city. The see of Buffalo, in the same State, counts 120,000 Catholics. Finally, the see of Newark, comprising the neighbouring State of New Jersey, and founded in 1853, has eight churches in the episcopal city, and thirty-one religious houses in the diocese.

It is difficult to estimate exactly the present religious statistics of that vast district which Bishop Connolly governed, only forty-five years ago, with the help of eight priests. As far as we can ascertain, with the assistance of the United States Catholic Directory, which does not always give the numbers, there are now more than six hundred priests in the State of New York. The number of Catholics, we imagine, must greatly exceed one million, as they amount to nearly a quarter of a million in Albany alone, and to 120,000 in Buffalo,—two of the dioceses comprised in the State,—while the single city of New York contains a much larger number.

The progress of the Church in New York, with its multitude of Catholic institutions, which have all been created, as the Bishop of Newark observes, "by the Catholics of New York themselves," is almost without a parallel, except in other cities of the same continent. In this city there were, in 1869, *seventy-four* Catholic churches and chapels—forty of the former and thirty-four of the latter—of which a list is given in the Directory. This number includes neither the cathedral of S. Patrick, nor the new cathedral now in course of erection in Fifth Avenue, of which Mr. Maguire gives the following description:—"This magnificent structure, which is being constructed of white marble, will be one of the grandest churches in the world. Its dimensions are these—length, 330 feet; breadth of nave, 130; of transept, 172; height of interior, from floor to crown of arched ceiling, 110; height of aisles, 54; elevation of its two towers and spires, 320 feet each. And this all in white marble!" It is a decisive proof of the power and energy of the Catholics of New York, that they should not only have undertaken such a work, but feel confident of completing it.

In Maryland, as in Virginia, the conflict between good and evil, between the Church and the sects, lasted longer, and was not less fruitful in instructive lessons. Virginia was the special field of the Church of England. An unprejudiced historian of the United States, Mr. Bancroft, relates that all the benefices in that State were filled, "under the patronage of the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts,"

by men "ordained in England, and for the most part of English birth, too often ill-educated and licentious men, whose crimes quickened Virginia to assume the advowson of its churches."* So universal was the contempt into which the Episcopalian sect fell in Virginia, that, during the last century, as an Anglican prelate observes, "instead of any growth throughout an extent of country one hundred miles long, and fifteen broad, *every church and chapel had been forsaken.* Such was the deadly trance which had fallen on the Church."† Yet in the midst of this striking proof of their zeal and merit, the Anglican clergy in Virginia never relaxed either their avarice or their bigotry, so long as the authority of England could shelter them. "Virginia," says Mr. Howison, "is the proper field for those who wish to study one of the closing pages of American intolerance."‡ At the present day, the Episcopalians of Virginia, like those of Ohio, and some other States, are simply Methodists in doctrine, though they retain the liturgy and other forms of the Church of England. The State is occupied by two Catholic dioceses, Richmond and Wheeling, but only numbers between thirty and forty thousand Catholics.

The history of Maryland is, in some respects, more remarkable than that of any State in the Union. It was the exceptional fortune of this province, although a British colony, to be founded by Catholics. Perhaps it was owing to this fact that it presented so great a contrast, even in temporal matters, to the neighbouring State of Virginia. "Within six months," says Mr. Bancroft, "the colony of Maryland had advanced more than Virginia had done in as many years."§ But this was not the only point of difference between the Catholic and the Anglican colony. In the latter, the injustice and brutality with which the natives were treated, and of which the "ill-educated and licentious" clergy too often set the example, produced the same results as in New England. "To such conduct," observes the historian of Virginia, "does America owe the undying hatred of the aboriginal tenants of her land."‖ On the other hand, the Indian tribes of Maryland received from the Catholic colonists such constant proofs of justice and charity, that, as Mr. Buckingham relates, "their generosity won the hearts of their new Indian friends."¶ Yet the Catholic pilgrims, who landed on the banks of the Potomac in March, 1634, "were met by large bodies of armed

---

* Vol. iii., p. 95.
† Wilberforce, ch. viii., p. 276.
‡ "History of Virginia," ch. vii., p. 431.
§ Vol. i., p. 188.
‖ Howison, ch. i., p. 57.
¶ "America," vol. i., ch. xx., p. 388.

natives," who quickly summoned other "savages from far and near to repel the invaders." But "their hostility was soon disarmed by the conciliatory policy of the immigrants;" and "Maryland was almost the only state whose early settlement was not stained with the blood of the unfortunate natives."* Nor was this all. "In various quarters conversions were made of entire towns or tribes. At the Indian town of *Potopaco*, for example, nearly all the native inhabitants embraced Christianity. . . . We believe that there is, at this day (1869), a Christian population at *Potopaco*, now Port Tobacco, not less in numbers than at the day of conversion of the young queen, and her adherents."†

But there is another particular in which the contrast between the two States is still more instructive. In Virginia, the ferocious intolerance of New England was faithfully imitated by the Anglican clergy, as long as they had the power to follow an example so attractive to men of their disposition and habits. Lord Baltimore had, himself, suffered persecution, and was expelled from Virginia on account of his religion; yet, as Mr. Bancroft observes, the first act of the Governor of Maryland was to prohibit, by law, every act of persecution, "directly or indirectly, for or in respect of religion. Under the mild institutions of Baltimore," continues the same historian, "the dreary wilderness soon bloomed with the swarming life and activity of prosperous settlements; the Roman Catholics, who were oppressed by the laws of England, were sure to find a peaceful asylum in the quiet harbours of the Chesapeake; and there, too, *Protestants were sheltered against Protestant intolerance*. Such were the beautiful auspices under which the province of Maryland started into being. Its history is the history of benevolence, gratitude, and toleration."‡

It was not long before the character of the Catholic colony became generally known; and from all quarters the victims of persecution hurried to seek refuge under its merciful laws. "Emigrants arrived from every clime; and the colonial legislature extended its sympathies to many nations, as well as to many sects. From France came Huguenots; from Germany, from Holland, from Sweden, from Finland, the children of misfortune sought protection under the tolerant sceptre of the Roman Catholic. Bohemia itself, the country of Jerome and of Huss, sent forth its sons, who at once were made citizens of Maryland, with equal franchises."§

---

* McSherry, p. 8.
† *Id.*, p. 11.
‡ Vol. i., p. 188.
§ Bancroft, i., p. 523.

Lord Baltimore died, and though his sons continued his policy, the ruinous influence of Anglican institutions was now to be once more manifested. "The powerful influence of the Archbishop of Canterbury," says Mr. Bancroft, "was solicited to secure an establishment of the Anglican Church, which clamoured for favour in the province where it already enjoyed equality. The prelates demanded, not freedom, but privilege; an establishment to be maintained at the common expense of the province. The English ministry soon issued an order that offices of government in Maryland should be intrusted exclusively to Protestants. *Roman Catholics were disfranchised in the province which they had planted!*"

And then the triumphant Anglican clergy—"men stained by intemperance and lust," as Mr. Bancroft relates, and not a few of them "ruffians, and fugitives from justice"*—began their usual work, sure of the approval of their friend, the "Archbishop of Canterbury," and of their patron, the "Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts." "In the land which Catholics had opened to Protestants," says the candid Mr. Bancroft, "the Catholic inhabitant was the sole victim to Anglican intolerance." "The Catholics of Maryland," observes another Protestant writer, "who acted with so much liberality to their Protestant brethren," received in return "the basest ingratitude;" and when at length the Church of England was declared by law, in spite of the notorious character of its colonial clergy, to be a part of the constitution of the State of Maryland, "Catholics were prohibited, under the severest penalties, from all acts of public worship, and even from exercising the profession of teachers in education."†

The history of the Church of England is not pleasant reading anywhere, but in America it presents a mixture of sordid baseness in its agents, and cynical injustice in its acts, which even its official apologists have reluctantly revealed. It is not easy to conceive a record at once so ludicrous and so revolting as that which is supplied by the late Rev. Ernest Hawkins, secretary of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, in his account of "Anglican Missions in the North American Colonies;" or by the late Rev. James Anderson, a well-known and eloquent preacher, in his "History of the Colonial Church." Yet there are people still able to respect the Church of England, in spite of its shameful history, its solemn shams, and its omnigenous heresy, and even to believe that it is that very institution ordained by God for the healing of the nations, and established for ever as "the pillar and

* Bancroft, vol. iii., p. 98. † Buckingham, ch. xx., p. 387.

ground of the truth!" In like manner, there are thousands who still speak, with apparent gravity, of the "able and godly ministers" of New England, as champions of human freedom in particular, and examples of Christian virtue in general.

As long as they were supported by the home authorities, the Anglican clergy did what they could to make the existence of Catholics intolerable in Maryland. In 1717 an Act was passed which "imposed a duty of twenty shillings on every Irish servant imported, being Papists, with the avowed intention of preventing the growth of Papists."* Such were the arts to which these sectaries descended, at the very time when they were themselves a scandal to the natives, whom they did not so much as attempt to convert, and an offence to their co-religionists, whom they outraged by their greed and impurity. But they were destined to fall on evil days, and long after they had passed to their judgment, the Church which they vainly attempted to destroy was peacefully extending her borders, and spreading on every side like a goodly tree. The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, held in 1866, was attended by seven archbishops, thirty-eight bishops, and three mitred abbots; and one of the acts of the council was to appeal to Rome for the immediate creation of *fourteen* additional sees in various parts of the United States. The president of that council was the Most Rev. Martin John Spalding, the seventh Archbishop of Baltimore, and in 1869 this prelate could count *twenty-four* Catholic churches in his own cathedral city, and *twelve* in the city of Washington, also included in the archdiocese of Maryland. In the State in which the Anglican authorities once proscribed the exercise of the Catholic religion, there are now 200 priests, 30 religious, 11 ecclesiastical, and 10 literary institutions; besides four hospitals and nine orphan asylums, all maintained by the zeal and liberality of the faithful of Maryland. There were, moreover, in 1869, 50,000 Catholics in the single city of Baltimore, and 11,000 children in its schools.

As we have spoken of the Anglican, now denominated the "Protestant Episcopal" Church, in the United States, it may be convenient to say a few words in this place upon the present character of that community. Even more than in England, it is exclusively the church of the *respectable*. Its ministers are, with rare exceptions, men of untainted character, and exemplary in their domestic relations as fathers and husbands. Their flocks would consider it unreasonable to expect more. As to the internal condition of their com-

* Bayley, ch. i., p. 17.

munity, a recent publication affords all the information which can be desired, especially as it is written by a champion, who seems to be what would be called in England a "High Churchman," and to share the animosity of that school against the Catholic Church. His work was published in New York in 1868, and is entitled "The Protestant Episcopal Church: What she has, What she lacks."

"But a small proportion," says this gentleman, "of those who from time to time connect themselves with her, and receive confirmation, really become assimilated to her." It does not seem to have occurred to the writer that "confirmation," reduced to a form of words, stripped of all sacramental character, and administered by a layman, is not likely to exert a strong assimilating power.

"There are two schools in the Church," he continues, "which are *as far asunder as is possible* for those who yet hold the fundamental faith of all Christianity." He probably means by this phrase the mystery of the Incarnation, but does not seem to suspect that *every* dogma which God has revealed must be *fundamental* in this sense; that to deny it is to deny a divine truth. Thus, since our Blessed Lord said to Peter, and to him alone: "*To* THEE *do I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven*," it must be a perilous thing to be in open sedition against Peter. But our author does not stop to make reflections of this kind.

"Within the circumscription of this pale"—that is, the pale of the Protestant Episcopal Church—he says, "there are two doctrines taught, as diverse as those taught by any two sects in Christendom. Presbyterians and Methodists, or Methodists and Baptists, do not differ between themselves as much as do the High and Low Church parties." And then he draws a conclusion. "In a body which is compelled to allow such discordant teachings within its pale there cannot be said to be any authoritative teaching. The Church does not teach with authority simply because she states a definite doctrine in her Prayer Book," which he assumes without proving, "if that doctrine may be set aside by any of her ministers, and there is no possibility of enforcing conformity. Authority resides not in the statute book, but in the living ruler. If the ruler cannot enforce the laws, then authority is dead."

No religious institution, however, can acquire an authority which it did not possess in its origin; and it is too late now to lament that the Church of England, and its American offshoot, are powerless to enforce the conformity which they never possessed; and which, as this writer has discovered, "there is no possibility" of obtaining. He is able to perceive also that

this condition of things "makes the body *a mere inculcator of opinions*, not a teacher of truth." But this is precisely what has prolonged the existence of the Church of England; that she is merely an "inculcator of opinions," and allows her ministers to believe and teach almost anything they please. If she pretended to be "a teacher of truth," she would not survive six months.* Our author has reason to add, with the candour characteristic of his countrymen, that "so long as any body allows, within itself, such diverse and contradictory teachings, whatever it may arrogate to itself, it can only be regarded by others as a sectarian organization." "The claim to be Catholic," he adds, and this must be our final quotation, "*without any principle of organic unity*, is as absurd as it would be for a society of Methodists, or Presbyterians, or Baptists, to claim to be Episcopalians, because they made use of the book of Common Prayer, or wore the surplice."†

Such is the character of the American Episcopal sect, as described by its own friends. It appears, moreover, that its adherents are as languid in their support of it, as they are capricious in their dogmatic profession. "In many dioceses," says a General Convention of the so-called bishops of this community, in a public address to their flocks, "the contributions for the support of the bishop are sadly deficient, and numerous parishes are yearly reported to the various diocesan conventions as largely in arrear. Brethren, we are pained to state this discreditable fact."‡ They confirm it by details which they probably considered pathetic, but which are only

---

* The present Bishop of Winchester, Dr. Wilberforce, said in Convocation: "The Church of England had always within herself persons of extreme divergences of doctrine, a thing as inevitable as having different countenances on different men."—*Times*, February 19th, 1868.

The Bishop of Salisbury said the next day in the same place:—"If legislation were to take place upon many of these points *it would break up the Church*."

The Bishop of Ely said:—"In all times since the Reformation, the people had been allowed to hold *extreme* doctrines on one side and on the other, and he hoped the time would never come when they would not be allowed to do so."

Finally, the Archbishop of Canterbury said:—"As to divergences of opinion among the clergy, he did not wish to touch or restrain the liberty of the clergy."—*Times*, February 30th, 1868.

This incredible language proves that the Episcopal sect in the United States is only a faithful copy of that to which it owes its origin.

† "The Protestant Episcopal Church, &c.," pp. 9, 17, 18, 19, 21.

‡ "Journal of the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States," p. 9. (1862.)

ludicrous; and which do not encourage the expectation of any immediate improvement.*

Yet this religious body, though feebly qualified to do good, is not wholly powerless for mischief. A child can break what a giant cannot mend. The Protestant Episcopal Church, decent and orderly, free to a great extent from the coarse fanaticism of the rival sects, is exactly adapted to satisfy the numerous class who approve an "inculcator of opinions," but would be seriously alarmed by a "teacher of truth." It offers to such persons an appearance of organization, and a semblance of propriety, which sufficiently distinguish it, in their judgment, from other Lutheran or Calvinistic communities. And thus it displays a certain vitality, by detaining souls which are either deluded by its respectable air, or too indifferent to perceive that it is, in fact, "only a sectarian organization." In America, as in England, the more earnest escape constantly from its snares, but it lulls the rest into a contented slumber from which too many never awake in this world. It is probable, however, that the Protestant Episcopal community, which is recruited from a single class, and is incapable of acting on the nation at large, will be absorbed at no distant day, partly into the Catholic Church, partly into the various sects which only differ from the Episcopal by the fact that *they* present themselves to the world in their true character, and make no pretence to be anything but what they are. Such an institution, in spite of its respectability, is as powerless to arrest the final triumph of the Church as to avert its own downfall; and though it appears to a certain advantage by the side of noisier and more aggressive sects, no American so much as thinks of it as an instrument in preserving either faith or morals, while there are probably not a hundred men in the United States, Catholic or Protestant, who do not agree with Dr. Newman, that "to aim at making the nation Catholic by means of the Church of England"—or its American representative—"is something like evangelising Turkey by means of Islamism."†

We have still to trace briefly the progress of the Church in the other provinces of the United States, and first in the valley of the Mississippi, and the vast region which extends, through seventeen degrees of latitude, from the western extremity of Lake Superior to the Gulf of Mexico. Several years ago, an English traveller said, "During my stay in Missouri, I observed that the Romish faith was gaining ground

* "Journal of the General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States," p. 9. (1862).

† "Anglican Difficulties," lecture iii.

with a rapidity that outstripped all competition."* If he visited the same country now, he would find that faith everywhere triumphant.

In the State of Missouri there are now two dioceses, that of S. Paul, which comprises Minnesota and the Dacotah territory, and S. Joseph, only founded in 1868, which includes the district between the Missouri and Chariton rivers. The city of S. Paul, near the head waters of the Mississippi, has only been in existence a few years. Accustomed as we are to the prodigies of American progress, it seems almost incredible that in this, the most remote city in the north of the United States, there are already a cathedral and six Catholic churches! The Benedictine Abbey of St. Louis, on Lake Superior, is tenanted by thirteen German fathers, of whom the Right Rev. Rupert Seidenbusch is the Abbot, and twelve lay brothers. There were in the diocese, in 1869, after an existence of only eighteen years, 105 churches and 89 stations; 96 priests and ecclesiastical students; seven religious communities; four Indian missions, and about 80,000 Catholics.

Descending the Mississippi, we pass the State of Iowa, which constitutes the diocese of Dubuque. In Dubuque city, the residence of the bishop, there are, besides the cathedral, two Catholic churches. Twelve miles from this city is the Cistercian Abbey of Our Lady of La Trappe, with a community of 58 members. There are 18 convents or religious academies in the diocese, in six of which there are 90 professed Sisters of Charity. There are about 10,000 children in daily attendance in the schools. There appear to be about 90 priests, but the total number of Catholics in the diocese, in which there are 100 churches and 40 stations, is not given in the Directory. The diocese of Alton, in the neighbouring State of Illinois, though only in existence thirteen years, has 85,000 Catholics, while that of Vincennes, in Indiana, counts 75,000.

The archdiocese of St. Louis, which comprises part of the State of Missouri, is one of the most active centres of religious life in the whole region. In the single city of St. Louis, besides the cathedral, of which the clergy are Redemptorists, there are *twenty-two* Catholic churches, and seven chapels. Of these, six churches and one chapel have German congregations. There is a university, under the charge of nineteen Fathers of the Society of Jesus; a theological seminary with 90 students; 17 religious houses; and about 170 priests. In this case also the total number of Catholics is not given. We are told,

* "Travels in North America," by the Hon. C. A. Murray, vol. ii., ch. xiii., p. 309.

however, that in a single convent of Sisters of Mercy in the city of St. Louis, the average yearly number of female servants provided with situations is 1,000.

Omitting, for the sake of brevity, the dioceses of Little Rock, Natchez, Natchitoches, and Mobile, we come to New Orleans, the archiepiscopal city of Louisiana. In this city there are *twenty-five* Catholic churches. There are in the diocese seventeen different religious *orders*, and about 150 priests. The number of Catholics is very large, but we are unable to state it exactly.

If we turn now to the North West, the facts are equally consoling. We can only notice a few facts.

The diocese of Detroit, comprising the lower peninsula of the State of Michigan, may be considered ancient in speaking of America, since it has been in existence thirty-eight years. The cathedral city already contains *ten* Catholic churches, and the Catholic population of the diocese is about 150,000. The diocese of Erie has 30,000, and that of Fort Wayne, in Indiana, 45,000 Catholics. Omitting La Crosse, Marquette, and other dioceses, we must say a word of the important diocese of Milwaukee, founded in 1844, and comprising the southern part of the State of Wisconsin. Only thirty-six years ago, not only the city of Milwaukee had no existence, but not a white man had ever lived on the spot where it was afterwards to be built. In 1840, there was a population of about 2,000. The first bishop was the Right Rev. Martin Henni, who was consecrated in 1844. He "found in his vast diocese," says Mr. Maguire, "a Catholic flock of 20,000, scattered in every direction, twenty churches, most of them of the rudest construction, and *two* priests." There are now eight Catholic churches and a cathedral in the city of Milwaukee, and in the diocese, according to Mr. Maguire, who visited it in 1868, "322 churches, 16 chapels, 75 stations, and 400,000 Catholics." He adds, "as an illustration of the amazing growth of religious institutions" in the United States, that whereas only sixteen years ago "*four* sisters of the Order of Notre Dame founded a house in Milwaukee—the first house in the States,—now the Order is represented by *fifty-eight convents* in different parts of the Union, and nearly *five hundred* sisters."* The Council of Baltimore, as Mr.

* "The Irish in America," ch. xxviii., p. 529. The constant multiplication of religious orders in every part of the United States is a decisive refutation of the popular notion that monks and nuns have no place in the nineteenth century. In most of the States are communities, many of them very large and possessing noble institutions, of the children of S. Ignatius, S. Benedict, S. Francis, S. Alphonsus, S. Vincent de Paul,

Maguire notices, recommended the division of the State of Wisconsin into *three* dioceses, with Milwaukee as an archiepiscopal see. The new diocese of Green Bay, founded in 1868, has already more than 40,000 Catholics.

The diocese of Chicago, comprising part of the State of Illinois, offers a still more prodigious example of the growth of the Catholic Church in the great Republic of the West. This diocese has an existence of only *twenty-six* years, and there are at this moment more that twenty Catholic churches in the city of Chicago, and 60,000 Catholics. In the whole diocese there were, two years ago, 125 priests, 28 convents, and more than 250,000 Catholics.

A well-known ecclesiastic of Chicago, Dr. Thaddeus J. Butler, eloquently says:—

"Chicago cannot remember the time when her Catholic citizens were not among her elements of successful enterprise, and Catholic priests her powerful friends and direct benefactors. . . . So far from being shunned, the priest finds a cordial hand extended to him, a hearty good day wherever he turns; and when his charitable projects call for especial efforts, a friendly assistance is extended to him in a manner which shows that the interest is not merely a personal one, but that his mission in society is acknowledged and respected. . . . . Recognised as one of the principal agents of civilization in the West, the advances of the Church are regarded without dismay. . . . . Twelve years ago, there was a part of Chicago lying out in the open prairie. It was the unfenced pasture-ground of Chicago. Geese wandered at will, and the herdsmen drove to it without scruple the kine from every part of the city proper. The few grocers or dry goods shops were beer-saloons also; and drunkenness was making of it a very den of iniquity." The Jesuit Fathers gave a mission there, began with a small church, and have now completed "a stately edifice, with its beautiful altars and golden candlesticks, its ponderous bell swinging from its own campanile, and an organ, at the cost of 30,000 dollars, on its way from Montreal. No better location can now be found for a family, where boys and girls can both be educated, than this locality, which was twelve years ago the scandal of the city."*

---

and S. Paul of the Cross. In the great Benedictine Abbey near Latrobe, Pennsylvania, there are fifteen professed fathers, thirteen clerics, fifteen novices, fifty-seven scholastics, and seventy lay brothers. Among the female orders are Carmelites, Ursulines, Dominicanesses, Sisters of Charity, Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of the Sacred Heart, of Notre Dame, of the Holy Cross, Little Sisters of the Poor, and many others. When the Jesuits were driven from Piedmont, the banished fathers opened a college in California! They had soon 200 students. Religious communities have been the life of the world in all ages, and they will do for our brothers in America what they have done, and are doing, in every kingdom and province of Europe.

* "The Catholic Church in America," p. 37.

In the older States of Ohio, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania, the facts are hardly less striking. The three dioceses of Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Scranton, all in the latter State, contain 296 priests, and 378,000 Catholics; and there are about 30,000 in the smaller diocese of Harrisburgh. The single diocese of Louisville, in Kentucky, counts more than 80,000 Catholics. To the State of Ohio belong the archdiocese of Cincinnati, and the three dioceses of Cleveland, Covington, and Columbus. In the latter there are 40,000 Catholics; in Covington somewhat less; and in Cleveland, which has eleven churches in the episcopal city, more than 100,000. In the city of Cincinnati there are 24 Catholic churches, and 26 churches or chapels in the suburbs and immediate vicinity. In the archdiocese there are 122 churches, 13 chapels, and 42 stations. The number of priests was 135 in 1868, and of Catholics 139,000.

On the two sides of the Rocky Mountains are the archdioceses of San Francisco and Oregon City, and the dioceses of Grass Valley, Nesqualy, Monterey and Los Angelos, the latter with 30,000 Catholics; and Santa Fé, with 122,000, of whom 18,000 are Indians. In the city of San Francisco, there are 30,000 *Irish*-American Catholics, of whom Mr. Maguire relates, with reasonable pride, that they "possess one-fourth of the entire property of the city, or 20,000,000 out of 80,000,000 dollars;" and further, that "the Irish girls employed in San Francisco *annually* remit to Ireland the sum of 270,000 dollars," to assist their relatives in emigrating to a country where they have nothing to fear from iniquitous laws, and where their faith and virtue are honoured even by those who possess neither.

We have no space to speak of the Apostolic Vicariates of Colorado and Utah, of Kansas, Florida, Idaho, Montana, and Nebraska, in each of which the field is occupied by apostolic men, the fruit of whose patient toil will be gathered in hereafter by their successors. The sketch already presented will perhaps enable the reader to form a sufficient general idea of the marvellous progress of the Catholic Church, and to anticipate her future career, in the vast territory of which she already occupies so large a share that an American Protestant statesman could say, not long ago, without bitterness and without regret: "In half a century all our great centres of population will be Catholic." Between 1861 and 1867, 1,000 priests were added to her clergy, and 1,000 new churches were built, or nearly 170 per annum! What is the total number of Catholics in the United States at this day we are unable to affirm with precision. Some authorities put it as high as

9,000,000, and even higher, but this seems to us an excessive estimate, though we can give no distinct reason for thinking so. It is perhaps safe to say that the Catholics now form one-fourth of the whole population of the United States; and they are increasing in number not only more rapidly than all other classes, but at a greater ratio than the general increase of the whole population, large as that ratio is. Moreover, though of many different nations, they are of one heart and mind in all which relates to the interests of religion, and one also in their cordial attachment to the great Republic of which they will ever be the most ardent defenders. The Catholic hierarchy, which receives fresh additions almost yearly, now consists of sixty members,—viz.: seven archbishops, forty-six bishops, and seven vicars apostolic. There are also four mitred abbots. The constitution of this imposing hierarchy, inferior to none in apostolic gifts, is, in one respect, unique; and the distinction is one which cannot but prove an additional source of strength. Of the forty-nine prelates who attended at the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, sixteen were American, twelve French, nine Irish, three Spanish, two Flemish, two Swiss, two German, and one Austrian.* The flocks whom they govern are also composed of representatives of many races, though now one both in faith and nationality. At a Catholic manifestation in one of the great cities of the Union we were informed that among the 45,000 persons present, were 20,000 Germans, and 15,000 Irishmen; but all were evidently of one heart and one soul, fervent Catholics and loyal Americans.

As to the future progress of the Church, as estimated by Catholics themselves, we will quote the remark of a distinguished ecclesiastic of great experience, and so much esteemed even by Protestants, that when the present writer visited with him, in 1869, the President's mansion at Washington, as soon as the attendants saw his face they said with a smile: "Oh! you can go wherever you like," and actually left us to examine the house by ourselves. This priest, a man of singular gravity and discretion, said, in answer to our inquiry: "I believe that in twenty years every educated man in the United States, who cares for his soul, will be a Catholic." It is true that he added: "unfortunately, the number is not large."

Many facts illustrating the progress of the Catholic Church in the United States, as well as the nature of her operations, have in this brief sketch been necessarily omitted. We have said nothing of her missions to the natives in the earlier days

* Maguire, ch. xxviii., p. 523.

of the martyrs Jogues, Lallemand, and De Brebeuf, or of those which at this hour are conducted with such consoling success by Father De Smet and his companions. Yet nothing in her long history is more admirable, and it is an incontestable truth, demonstrated once more by the flourishing missions actually existing in the North West, that but for the more than heathen wickedness of the agents of Protestantism, all the tribes of North America might have been easily converted to the faith. "The Saxon," observes Sir Charles Dilke in 1868, "*is the only extirpating race on earth.*" Before English colonists, aided by so-called ministers of religion, had overwhelmed Red Indians, Maories, and Australians in a common destruction, "no numerous race had ever been blotted out by an invader. . . . The Spaniards not only never annihilated a people, but have themselves been almost completely expelled by the Indians of Mexico and South America."* What the French did, as long as they remained on the American Continent, and what "passionate attachment," as Mr. Bancroft relates, they inspired, is known to all the world, and is proved by the respect and affection with which they are named, even at this day, by Indians who never saw their faces. But they were supplanted by men to whom faith and charity were unmeaning words, and in whose presence whole nations have melted away. It was in vain that, in his third Annual Address to the Republic, Washington proposed "that efficacious provision should be made for inflicting adequate penalties upon all those who, by violating the rights of the Indians, shall infringe the treaties and endanger the peace of the Union." The maxims of Washington, who once told his fellow-citizens that "the spirit of party is itself a frightful despotism," are not now popular in the United States; and the Sioux chiefs who lately appeared at the city of Washington, could tell his successor, General Grant, with truth, that his government only made treaties with the Indians to deceive, and only gave promises to betray them. Yet among these Indians, who are restrained chiefly by the influence of Father De Smet from a general insurrection against their oppressors, which would only accelerate their destruction, are men who have a better claim to the title of Christians than some of the politicians of Washington or New York. The late Bishop Bruté, of Vincennes, who died in 1839, could describe the Indians of his diocese as men displaying such qualities of meekness, fervour, and devotion "as are not found, as often as they should be, among

* "Greater Britain," vol. i., ch. xxviii. p. 309.

the best instructed Christians of more favoured countries."* Father De Smet and his companions have at this day thousands of such disciples, but the Saxon wants their lands, and will get them, for "the Saxon is the only extirpating race on earth."

Among the conclusions to be drawn from the peaceful but rapid progress of the Church in the United States is one which her enemies would willingly reject if they could. It has often been said by heretics and unbelievers, though the assertion was ridiculed by the sagacious Macaulay, that universal education, and still more the growth of democratic principles, would prove fatal, wherever they were found, to Catholic doctrine and influence. This idea, founded upon ignorance of the true nature of the Church and her marvellous adaptation to the wants of all mankind, will now take its place in the catalogue of exploded delusions. There is not a land in Christendom where the unity of the faith is more unbroken, its integrity more unsullied, than in the American Republic. Nowhere are the faithful more docile in their loving submission to the Church, nor more impatient of the familiar sophistries which have had some success in older communities, but which only excite the contempt of American Catholics. The ablest and most learned of modern Anglican prelates, Dr. Thirlwall, is said to have made the acute observation, that what surprised him in the conversions of which England has been the theatre, was not that they should occur, but that men of such various gifts and temper, educated in Protestantism, should all believe and act, immediately after their conversion, exactly as if they had been Catholics from infancy. And this was undoubtedly true of English converts, with the exception of a very few unfortunate persons, too conceited to learn and too restless to obey, who had been led to despise Anglicanism without embracing the truth, and were, in fact, never converted at all. The same thing is seen every day in the United States. The present writer has conversed, on many occasions, in that country, with converts of various ranks,—shrewd lawyers and skilful physicians, literary men, soldiers, and merchants,—who had been converted in the prime of life, and in the full vigour of their intelligence, and in whom the phenomenon which excited Dr. Thirlwall's remark was conspicuously displayed. Men bred in prejudice and error, and for years the bondsmen of human opinions, knelt at Mass with the simplicity of children, adored the Mystery of the Altar with loving worship, accused themselves

* "Memoirs of the Right Rev. Simon Bruté, first bishop of Vincennes," by the Right Rev. J. R. Bayley, Bishop of Newark, p. 73. (1861.)

with generous candour in the Tribunal of Penance, and venerated the successor of Peter as their Father and Pontiff. Yet they continued to display a robust intellect in all the avocations of secular life, loved liberty with all the more ardour because they had learned to know it better, and would have smiled if any one had told them that it was impossible to be a devout Catholic and a good republican at the same time. Nor did they excite, as they would have done in England, the vulgar clamour of men besotted with prejudice and self-conceit. On the contrary, their admission into the Catholic Church was, with all but a few of the meaner sort, a new title to esteem. For in America, and especially since the Civil War, which brought into such instructive contrast the ministers of truth and error, men have learned to admire the Church even before they belong to her fold, and to respect her clergy even before they use their ministry. We should have been glad to give examples of this fact, but our limits are already exhausted, and we must hasten to an end.* It was in the following terms that a well-known Protestant journal, the *Baltimore Gazette*,† noticed the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, in 1866:—

It is but appropriate to the occasion, and it certainly is a pleasure to us to say, that the course of the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church, during our

---

* It is not, of course, implied that bigotry is unknown in the United States. While human nature is what it is, sectaries and unbelievers will instinctively hate the Church, because authority is odious to the one and the supernatural to the other. The greatest bitterness is manifested by Episcopalians, especially of the High Church school, of many of whom it seems unhappily true, that the nearer they approach to the Church in words, the further they depart from her in spirit. There is notably a Mr. Cleveland Coxe, a "bishop" in that sect, whose language is as grotesque in its malice and self-complacency as that of the worst railer in Exeter Hall. But the general feeling of American society rebukes this class of sectaries. One example of the absence of sectarian spite in that country, related to us last year by the Vicar Apostolic of Colorado, deserves mention. That prelate, who has, we believe, only one church in his vicariate, of which the too famous Denver City is the central point, travels constantly over his vast diocese, trusting to Providence for food and shelter, and preaching wherever he can find an audience. On one occasion he received a visit in a remote settlement from an amiable Baptist minister, who said to him, "Bishop, I hear you want to collect the Catholics together. I don't know if there are any here, but I will tell my people there will be no service in my chapel on Sunday evening, and it will be free for your use." The bishop accepted the friendly offer, and preached from the Baptist pulpit to an overflowing audience, among whom were the ministers of three different sects. It may be added, as an example of another kind, that at the great Jesuit College at Georgetown, a suburb of Washington, the prizes have been annually distributed for some years past by the President of the United States, of whom the last was a Unitarian and the present is a Methodist.

† October 8th, 1866.

late civil dissensions, will make this demonstration of its vitality and vigour *very welcome to multitudes*, who, but a little while ago, would have witnessed it with jealous concern. . . . They have preached only the Gospel, and the great doctrines of peace and good-will on which it rests, and have not sullied their altars with fratricidal emblems, or turned their anthems of praise into songs of hate and war. In the camps of both armies they were ministers of God only, and faithful to their high calling amid the terrors of the battle-field and the dangers of the pest-house and the hospital; they dedicated themselves exclusively to the alleviation of bodily suffering and the gentle and holy ministerings of religious consolation. *It is for this that men reverence them to-day*, who, ten years ago, would have been prompted by prejudice to revile them. It is for this that the Church, whose ministers they are, is recognized now by thousands who dispute its creed as a worthy depository and teacher of the sacred truths which, in making men Christians, make them love one another. In all the proud annals of the Church of Rome there is no prouder page than that which records her purity and stedfastness and independence—her indifference alike to the threats and seductions of power during the Confederate Revolution.

With this generous confession we may cite, in conclusion, the equally striking testimony of a different writer:—

"The idea that the Catholic Church is no foreigner," says Dr. Butler, "is fast gaining credence among the American people; and this is a stronger point than could be believed by mere lookers on. America has called to her rich shores and the protection of her free government all nations of the civilized world; all nationalities are there represented; and yet from this apparently heterogeneous mass springs forth an *individual nationality*, young, vigorous, hopeful, to the educating and developing of which Catholicity has pledged herself with all the energy of a divine charity and a supernatural vocation. . . . America will yet repay to Europe all she may receive by that beautiful law of reciprocity in which she even now delights; and the Holy See will not fear to lean upon the vigorous arm already developing its sinews and nourishing its strength for the defence of God's Church, the supremacy of S. Peter, and the honour of that Immaculate Mother under whose patronage Catholicity was planted, and under whose patronage Catholicity will finally become the beneficent guide, the beloved instructress, and the national faith of the United States of America."*

* P. 39.

Art. IV.—LACORDAIRE AND THE CONFERENCES OF NOTRE DAME.

Vie du R. P. Lacordaire. Par M. Foisset. 2 tomes. Paris : Jacques Lecoffre, 1870.

Œuvres du R. P. H.-D. Lacordaire. Paris : Poussielgue-Rusaud, 1861.

Le Testament du P. Lacordaire. Publié par le Comte de Montalembert. Paris : Charles Douniol, 1870.

Correspondance du R. P. Lacordaire et de Madame Swetchine. Publiée par le Comte de Falloux. Paris : Didier et C^ie^ : 1864.

The Inner Life of the Very Rev. Père Lacordaire. Translated from the French of the Rev. Père Chocarne, O.P., by a Religious of the same Order. Dublin : Kelly.

ON Easter-day, in the year 1840, at the hour of half-past four of the afternoon, a Dominican preached a sermon in the Church of San Luigi dei Francesci, at Rome. A witness who was present at the sermon tells us, that the impression it produced was immense. The audience, as they left the church, hardly waited till they reached the doors to ask their questions, and to utter their exclamations; and the discussion, thus begun, spread into the city, and was the occupation of Rome for fifteen days. The preacher was vehemently blamed and vehemently praised. At the embassies, whose members had assisted in force at his discourse, it was said that he was a revolutionist and a firebrand. But the ecclesiastical personages present, among whom were a cardinal and four bishops, various members of the Roman prelacy, Jesuits, and friars of the orator's own Order, were unanimous in declaring that nothing heterodox had passed his lips. The sermon was the first sermon preached in Rome by Henri-Dominique Lacordaire. It was only eight days before, on Palm Sunday, that he and Réquedat had pronounced their solemn vows at the convent of La Quercia, near Viterbo, on the eastern slope of the Apennines; and it was, therefore, the first sermon that he had preached in the white frock and black mantle of a friar preacher. He was at one of the turning-points of his great career, and the audience, whose fears were roused or whose sympathy was won by his words on that day, may have felt themselves in the presence of the heroic, as they realized the apparition of such a man, in such a garb, in the church of the French nation, in the city of the Popes. He was near his fortieth year, when youth has parted with some of its

fire, in exchange for the strength and soberness of middle age. But Lacordaire had lived more years than he could count winters and summers. Since he had found once more, at the age of twenty-two, the faith that he had abandoned since his first communion, he had been shaken with grand aspirations, transformed by splendid successes, and chastened by heavy trials. His name was before the world, but his heart, during those years, had belonged to none but God. He had touched the orbit of an unhappy genius and had drawn back, wounded in heart; he had said strong things, full of truth, but touched with error, and had had the grace of the words of a Pope; he had found in himself the mighty gift of speaking to a nation and to a generation, a gift that cannot work within the man who has it without lifting his nature out of Nature's common level, for splendid good or for mournful evil; and he had taken to heart—to a heart as sensitive as it was large—the indifference, the coldness, the ignorance, and the malice that, like unwholesome plants in a baleful shade, increase and multiply when change is in the air and the times are difficult, when strong wickedness is active, and timid goodness fears to stir. The tall figure, the dark flashing eyes, and the noble head, well known under the vaults of Notre Dame, were those of a man who had taken a great step, and who felt a strength, a security, and a peace such as he had never felt before. All the great aspirations of his life were as ardent as they had ever been, but it seemed that he felt himself now armed with a new power to impart them to the world. The subject of his sermon on that day was the power of the Resurrection. He said that Christ rising again was the triumph of Christianity, in the order of ideas, in the order of affections, and in the order of power. The Resurrection taught the mystery of death, inspired the world with the power of sacrifice, and gave to it the secret of martyrdom. Martyrdom, which was the creation of the Resurrection, was the only spiritual weapon against physical force and the tyranny of the temporal power. The Church was triumphant at that moment. Protestantism was dying, barren, and childless. Rationalism would die too. It was in France especially that the Church was advancing to her triumph. If Rome was the head and the heart of Christianity, France was its right arm. Even in this brief description of a sermon that has not been fully reported, there is no mistaking Lacordaire. It paints him as he lived and moved. "The world," he seems to say, "or at least that important part of it represented by France, has lost its sense of religion; nothing can save it but Jesus Christ and the supernatural revelation which is His Church. Then let me preach Jesus Christ! But the preacher of Christ is everywhere met by the secular power. Kings and ministers, councils of state, and prefects of police, cannot endure to hear of Christ

and of His Church. They try to suppress them. They weaken where they cannot destroy; they muzzle where they cannot banish. But we, the Catholics, the believers in Christ,—we especially, the ministers of Christ,—we protest with all our strength against this treatment, and we call it tyranny. This tyranny of the temporal power we mean to resist. We utterly refuse to be suppressed, to be held down, to be muzzled. We appeal to the very principles that the temporal power at the present day, in France at least, depends upon for its own existence; as S. Paul appealed to Cæsar, we appeal to Liberty. We do not want favour; we do not ask for protection; what we demand is, liberty. Give us liberty and leave us to do our own work. We know what to do, and how to do it. We have truth, that is to say, Faith. We know the hearts of our countrymen, and we have the power of speech. Allow us to speak, to worship with our full ritual, to open our schools, to publish our journals and our books, to associate in our orders and our confraternities, to communicate as we please with our Pope at Rome, and then we will answer for the result. All this we demand, and we mean to have, and we purpose to agitate for by every lawful means."

Here was an attitude which is familiar enough to us in England. But even in England it is often the cause of many inconvenient positions, and in France, thirty or forty years ago, it was liable to as many more inconveniences as it was so much more novel, and so much less understood. To appeal to liberty is to appeal to an absurdity, because, according to reason and common sense, liberty, understood as including the right to go wrong, does not exist. A man has no *right* to be an infidel, or a heretic, or immoral, or rebellious; though he often has the power. But the modern doctrine, then as now, affirmed that such a right did exist. It was to this doctrine that Catholics were to be taught to appeal, and it was this theory which they were to be called upon to approve in practice. That both the appeal and the practical admission and approval are perfectly lawful, no one can dispute. In the hypothesis that my turbulent neighbours claim it as their right to do wrong, it is perfectly lawful for me to appeal to their own principles in order to be able to do right. In the hypothesis that everybody round about me does all kinds of improper things under the plea of doing as he likes, I may justly claim to practise my religion and to do proper things, under the same plea. But the plea is a bad one. Only my neighbours who have adopted it have no right to say so to me. Still, since it is a bad one, it must never be used *absolutely;* that is, as if it were the truth; but only *hypothetically,*—that is, as an argument *ad hominem* for a state of things which is not a good one, but the best that can be brought about. A Catholic fighting by means of such a principle as liberty, understood as explained

above, is like a soldier who has manœuvred himself into a false position, where his right-hand man is technically his left, and his own rank, though called the front, is really the rear. He will be sure to find it very difficult to conquer one set of associations derived from his senses by another set derived from his drill-sergeant. And no doubt it will often be the same with a Catholic who uses the appeal to liberty. The current of modern talk and the din of modern sophistry will often make it hard for him to remember where he is really facing, and what is the direction of the polar star.

But such was the attitude of Lacordaire. The very greatness of his work and of his genius is shown by this, that he had to take up such a position at such a time, and through a long and agitated life maintain a footing that must of its own nature be slippery and insecure, against the folly and madness of revolution, against the fears of a large party of Catholics, and, most difficult of all, against the shortsightedness and the longings after the forbidden which are the inheritance of every man that is born in original sin. The questions involved in the consideration of the relations between the Christian Church and the Christian State are difficult and intricate; and they were much more so forty years ago. The subject of liberty is one of those in which sophistical philosophy has had a practical success such as it seldom falls to philosophy to boast; but it has succeeded more because it was sophistical than because it was philosophy. In most other questions the world can afford to let speculation go on its way with slight regard; but in the matter of liberty, it has come to pass that a man must have his theory and fight for it, just as he has his trade and fights for his daily bread. No teacher of the people can open his mouth in this nineteenth century without speaking about liberty; and it would be little wonder, if, forty years ago, when there were no instructions like the *Mirari vos* or the *Quanta cura*, the best-intentioned men sometimes said things that could not stand. And supposing that men hold right principles on Church and State, on liberty, and on kindred questions, still another difficulty comes up, the ever-recurring difficulty of being prudent and opportune. No one can appreciate the great figure of Lacordaire without remembering his attitude and his epoch, the necessity of his hypothesis and the truth of the thesis with which it can so easily be made to conflict.

An apology for Lacordaire is not what is here proposed. No proposition he ever uttered has ever been condemned by the Holy See.* But his life is an instructive lesson as well as a stirring

* Doubtless, some things that he said in the *Avenir* were implicitly condemned by Gregory XVI.; but the *Avenir* is really no part of the true Lacordaire.

exhortation. To pass in review some of its leading features will not be uninteresting to our readers. If some faults come out in the process, no one will be surprised, for saints can err and genius is not infallible. If we confine ourselves chiefly to the Conferences that he delivered in Notre Dame de Paris, it is, first, because these were the great instrument of his influence upon his age and country; and, secondly, because his life is full of so many points of view, and he is the centre of such an extensive literature that it would require a volume rather than an article to do him even justice. The political aspects of his life would, perhaps, bear much anxious discussion; but we willingly dismiss them for the present, as dry and obsolescent. His alleged liberalism, upon which we have made a few remarks, might be a theme for much disputation.* In confining ourselves to serener realms of biography, philosophy, oratorical triumphs, and priestly devotion, we shall be occupied with the most lasting part of the genius of Lacordaire.

It is an obvious thing to say, that in judging of a man on the whole, allowance must be made for progress in his life. All men who are worthy the name make "stepping-stones of their dead selves," and grow wiser as they grow older. But this truth is much more important in considering the life of a holy Christian, who lives and educates himself in the atmosphere of supernatural grace. Like the physiognomist who set down Socrates as an ill-tempered man, not knowing that philosophy had cured him, we should be as often wrong as right, in the case of men of God, if we judged them by what we might know of the forces and the promptings of their mere nature. Yet there is much to be learnt from the study of a nature like that of Lacordaire. It is a study that tells a story of conflict and victory. But it is also a study which helps us to understand his peculiar gifts of grace; for nature is not evil in itself, but only indifferent, incapable, and weak, and grace frequently seeks out the poor wounded thing, and acts the good Samaritan by setting it upon her own beast and passing it on to heaven with her own coin.

Perhaps the note of "independence" is the one which singly defines Lacordaire's nature the best. In one of his letters to Madame Swetchine, written in the autumn of 1836, after his first two years of Notre Dame, he sketches himself playfully, but very

---

* We gladly refer the reader to an article in the *Month* for May, 1870, which sufficiently brings out the real facts regarding Lacordaire's liberal professions. In principle, he was no more a liberal than a perfectly orthodox Catholic may be. In practice, especially in early life, he has spoken unguardedly sometimes; and it is possible that in many questions of detail he would have differed (and did differ) from Catholics who had not had the same rude experiences as himself, or who had been able to form calmer and truer judgments on past history and present vicissitudes.

truthfully. He says that he does not find much to like in Tivoli and the environs of Rome; the *ensemble* is magnificent, the details are meagre, bare, and arid. But he excepts the Roman Campagna; its vastness, its ramparts of mountains, the infinite variety of its volcanic mounds and hills and scattered ruins delight him exceedingly. In wandering over it one day he had come suddenly upon the Tiber; it was the first time he had seen the ancient river free and solitary in the open country; it was like meeting an old friend unexpectedly in the desert. "I have an idea," he continues, "of riding all over the plain; you cannot conceive how fond I am of discovering unknown regions, of hunting into every nook and corner of them, and appropriating them to myself. I certainly must have something of the Arab in me."* He certainly had. He had the Arab's impatience of conventionality, the Arab's consciousness of being self-sufficing, and the Arab's proverbial simplicity. Like the Arab, he was by nature a dweller in tents, for the earth on which he dwelt was to him nothing more than a means to be used for a higher purpose and then abandoned. That purpose, in his early unbelieving days, was fame. He left college at the age of seventeen, with his religion in ruins and with no principles of morality in his heart, but straightforward, frank, impetuous, sensitive in honour, fond of literature and of all that was beautiful, and the torch that guided the steps of his life was human glory. Child of an age that knew not what it was to obey, independence, then and afterwards, was his couch and his guide. He lived almost by himself. Paris, where he dwelt for some months after leaving the law school at Dijon, and before his conversion,—Paris, that dazzled and spoiled other men—was to him a vast and profound solitude, where none cared for him; and his soul, in solitary communion with itself, without faith and without God, fed upon the pride of glory to come. No friends sought him out, no tide of politics or of party carried him hither or thither, no influence or attachment guided him or helped him, no fireside welcomed him to quiet enjoyment. Solitary and poor, working hard but secretly, without a joy or a pleasure for which he depended upon the world outside, he nursed the hopes of his twenty years on the vague anticipation of future fame. He had his successes as an advocate; but they could not carry him away. It was during these months of stern and melancholy labour that the great thoughts of Christianity came gradually back to find a home in the heart of the man who was thus a hermit in the midst of eight hundred thousand souls. After his conversion, at the age of twenty-two, in the beginning of the year 1824, a very different element begins to be counted in his life. We shall see presently how divine grace and the supernatural

* Correspondance du R. P. Lacordaire et de Madame Swetchine, p. 77.

acted upon his "Arab" spirit, and how magnificent were the results.

But to state that "independence" is the best definition of Lacordaire's nature, is hardly to put him before the eye as he was. Independence implies the consciousness of sufficiency for one's self, and the admiration of one's own excellence. If this consciousness be mere stupidity, and this admiration be nothing but the foolish vanity of a small mind, then independence becomes silly conceit, and is probably no real independence at all. But a soul like that of Lacordaire, viewed on the side of mere nature, had little to do with vulgar vanity; and, if *he* admired his own excellence and wrapped himself up in his own being, it was because that excellence was real. What was he, then—this young barrister, in the solitude of his chamber, alone with his sadness and his hopes? His future, which he so often tried to penetrate, is open to us who have seen him pass away, and what it has revealed we may now study.

If there is one element in a man's nature that seems to give him the right to stand by himself in solitary dignity, it is the gift of Character. Character is a man's moral power. It is the effect produced upon the wills of other men by the exhibition of strength of will and tenacity of conviction. For the privilege of this power, good intentions are not enough. A man must have the gift of seeing with a sort of infallibility what is the right thing to do, and a masterful and overpowering way of carrying it through and doing it. Mistakes are not always fatal to character, especially if the mistakes arise from a strong principle, although narrowly and wrongly held; but the man of character is, in the first place, one who does not veer and change about; in the second, one who is not less but rather more in act than in word; and in the third, a man who never accepts a false situation. In the age in which Lacordaire lived, a Frenchman with a character was a rare sight. It is always so at times when what may be called the great tidal waves of human history have culminated and spent their force. After Christianity had advanced and seized upon the throne of the Roman Empire, Christian bishops seemed to lose their aggressive force; and even Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, and Jerome could not save the world from the lower empire. After the death of Beza, and even before it, the great rebellion of the human intellect, that had scorned kings as it had defied popes, dwindled down into the shoal water of traditional and commonplace error, and despotic rulers made haste to profit by the obsequiousness and timidity of a smaller race of men.

In 1802, the year of the birth of Lacordaire, two significant things happened, each of which marked, in its way, that the tide had turned in France. The Church was restored, and Napoleon

became First Consul for life. The age of gigantic violence was over for good and for evil, and it was time to look out for the mediocrities, also for good and for evil. By the time that the young advocate, at the age of twenty, had taken the oath before the Court of Paris, Louis XVIII. had reigned for seven years. France seemed to be thoroughly frightened. It is true, she seems to have been still more thoroughly frightened since; but the difference is, that it was the good and the pious that were frightened under Louis and Charles, whereas, since 1848, the indifferent and even the bad have become infected with the panic fear. The bishops and the older clergy under the Restoration were in no humour to stand out against a Government that professed to protect them. No one can blame them for this. The State is often unjust to the Church, but anything is better than revolution and anarchy. But ministers like Frayssenous and Feurtrier were worse than anything except revolution. The danger for France was not Gallicanism so much as death. Doubtless the ministers did their best to bring back the times of Louis XIV. and 1682, and a minority of the bishops allowed themselves to be degraded into a servility whose nakedness was screened by the name of Bossuet. But the question was not precisely there. The French nation, nominally Catholic, was really infidel. Its peasants, its women, some of its ancient gentry had kept the faith; but its great "thinkers," its politicians, academicians, generals, magistrates, its bureaucracy and its bourgeoisie, were a generation whose catechism had been cut short when their fathers had set up the guillotine, and whose first communions had been prevented by the desecration of their altars and the flight of the priests. The French Church had come back into the stone walls of its ancient inheritance, but the Church's faith had not come back into the hearts of the French people. To be feeble, to be unequal for the work, was to die. It was a time for barefooted missionaries rather than beneficed *curés*. Position and revenues were certainly advantages, but action and success were necessities. But it was precisely at this moment that the Church came before the nation in the odious character of a department of police. An unpopular Government that tried to renew many of the bad old traditions of immoral despotism, was seen by the popular imagination to pay its priests as it paid its soldiers, and to use both the one and the other to "administer" and fetter the people. It was in vain that the Catholic religion was declared the religion of the State, that the observance of Sunday was commanded, that divorce was no longer legal, that a bishop was minister of ecclesiastical affairs, that the seminaries and the primary schools were given up to the clergy; and that even the ministers, the prefects, and the higher magistrates (as under Charles X.), were most of them good

Catholics. The Church made no progress. Irreligion, in some points, seemed to grow worse. Voltaire and Rousseau had never been reprinted under the empire. From 1817 to 1824 there appeared twelve editions of the former and thirteen of the latter. Helvetius, Diderot, d'Holbach, Dupuis, Volney, rose from their tombs. In Lacordaire's own phrase, a whole army of ghosts was summoned up, by the call of angry fanaticism, to do battle against the Church, and the deluded generation thought the ghosts were flesh and blood. The dirty rubbish of Pigault-Lebrun was scattered over the country to the extent of 32,000 copies. Béranger's *chansons* were a power in the land. Secret societies and deists opposed the Church because they hated her, whilst the immense mass of those who were nervously afraid of the phantom of the ancient *régime* opposed her because they considered her to be part of what they dreaded.* The Church was feeble, partly because she was encumbered by the protection of the State. Had it been really and loyally protection, the Church would have been comparatively fortunate, and might have begun to bring the mighty mass of her Revelation to bear upon the heart of France. But the protection of the State was the hug of a bear, not the support of a brave and gentle arm; and it wrung from an Archbishop of Paris—no other than the martyred Affre—in an interview with Louis Philippe, a cry that was a bold one for such a man, "The Church wants liberty, not protection." But this was in 1846, and it was the preceding sixteen years which had made that wish possible in the mouth of an Archbishop of Paris. The want of the time had been a brave and great man. Especially after the days of July (1830), France had almost seemed to stand breathless and listening for the first sounds of a voice that was to lead it. On the 29th of July, 1830, the man whose word was to do so much for France was in the streets of Paris in the very hour of revolution. He was now a priest, but he could not appear as a priest at a time like that. As he walked from the Collége Henri IV., and crossed the Seine, near the Palais de Justice, on his way to the Madeleine, the terrible signs of a bloody insurrection were all about him. He saw the thick smoke that overhung the Louvre, where the last victory was being won; he passed the blood-stained bodies of dead soldiers; he walked through streets that were strewed with the relics of a conflict; he saw the mob in the Tuileries and in the streets, rejoicing and triumphing in their victory; and he returned home that night after having witnessed one of the grand scenes of the world—the fall of one dynasty and the rise of another, a people triumphing over the ruins of a monarchy of ten centuries, liberty victorious and sure of an end-

* Foisset, i. 23.

less reign. "I lay down that night," continues Lacordaire, "sure in my own mind that Providence was going to change my own destiny also."* France waited for a man to save her from servility by standing out for the rights of faith, and to save her from anarchy by laying upon her the yoke of Christ. Lacordaire was little known yet; but the strong mind that was to see so clearly and speak so roundly was already well matured. As a boy at Dijon he had talked and been a leader. Not very industrious, and lively even to recklessness, he had proved his strong control of his strong nature by patient study and brilliant success when he wished to succeed. His face was calm and his manner was gentle, but under it all the resolute will was easy to be seen.† The force that led him to Catholicism as he grew older was, after grace, simply the use of his own earnest reason, which he handled, so to speak, with a will that suffered nothing to have any weight except the honest truth that he saw. No books, no influence, no voice of friend or master brought him back to Jesus Christ. It was a silent revolution or development that went on during the years of his stern seclusion at Paris. He saw God's light, and, quietly but irresistibly, he caused his nature to live within it. The inward power that made him a Catholic made him a priest. Gerbet and De Salinis introduced him at Issy; but they walked by his side without influencing his resolve. S. Sulpice was suspicious of such a masculine neophyte, and it had some reason for its suspicions. But when the earnest eyes of the young cleric began to turn towards Montrouge, the difficulties disappeared, and Lacordaire was ordained priest under the vaulted roof of Notre Dame. Then he passed three years in quiet priestly work, in study, in solitude. He lived as he had lived before his conversion; but now his law was transformed into theology, and the love of glory in his heart had given place to the love of God. He thought much of the age, and of a priest's duties to the world of his own day. He thought of going to America. It was only a thought. The revolution of 1830 broke out; and, as the echoes of its violence died, the *Avenir* was founded. There is a description of him at that period of his life left us by one who was most dear to him and knew him well. "I cannot," says Montalembert, "I cannot paint him as he then appeared to me, in all the charm and attractiveness of youth! He was twenty-eight. . . . His lofty stature, his fine and regular features, his classic brow, the royal carriage of his head, his black and sparkling eye, his haughty bearing, so refined and yet so modest,—all this was but the outward setting of a soul that seemed ready and eager at once for the war of public speech

* "Testament," 49. † Letter of M. Delahaye, 20th March, 1862.

and for the tenderness of private friendship. The fire of his glance showed truth and affection both: it looked round for hearts to captivate as well as enemies to fight. His voice was even now strong and resonant, and fell at times in cadences so infinitely sweet. By nature a warrior, by nature meant to love, he was already stamped as a king—a king in genius and a king in soul. To me he was charming and terrible, the type of enthusiasm for good, of virtue armed for truth."* This was a man. Now that he had put his foot upon the great stage of the world, even those that ran must turn to listen to his firm and living words. He knew what he aimed at, and he felt in his heart every formula of his lips. A strong man in earnest cannot help stirring the heart of his generation. But Lacordaire had another gift besides character.

He was a genius. He was not an Ajax, doing his best to make up by the weight of his arm for the dearth of his wit. His sword, rather, like the sword of Michael,—

> "From the armoury of God
> Was given him temper'd so, that neither keen
> Nor solid might resist that edge."†

The weapon of Lacordaire was a wonderfully powerful intuition, that ran easily into a mould of words in which imagination predominated. The essence of genius seems to be intuition. Common minds move painfully from judgment to judgment, from singulars to universals, from universals to singulars. Powerful minds move more quickly, by the virtue of some hidden force that opens secret and swift paths. The greatest minds seem to leap from pole to pole, like the coursers of Zeus, with bounds that matter cannot affect. Intuition may be strong in one direction and weak in another, and then we have a genius with a specialty, a mathematical, a chemical, a musical genius. Or it may be the intuition of abstract truth, and then we have the metaphysician. Or it may be the intuition of action, which is seen so strongly in the heroes of war and of politics. Lastly, there is an intuition which grace gives, and which is made up of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit; and this intuition produces the saint. The man who possesses a splendid intuition of lofty moral truth has one of the noblest forms of genius that this world can boast. His genius is familiar with speculation, but it burns with the fire of action; it is a human and natural endowment, but of all natural things it seems to give itself up most easily to the transmutations of supernatural grace. It seizes with a keen grasp the ideas of truth, the

* "Le Père Lacordaire," p. 13. † "Paradise Lost," vi. 321.

problems of human nature with their solutions, and has short processes of dialectics, known to itself alone; whilst, at the same time, it is endowed with that sovereign gift which Plato, in the "Republic," calls "synopsis," and finds cause and effect, system, relation, beauty, and harmony, where ordinary minds see nothing but the hard facts of life and the narrow horizon of the present hour. Raised up above the world by a mysterious privilege, it can look beyond the phenomenal, the limited, the local, and the temporal, and appreciate the far-off presence of the absolute, the eternal, the immutable, and the infinite. Such was the genius of Lacordaire. And it has not merely illuminated the world and then departed like a meteor: it has built itself a monument. If he had merely spoken, the men who heard him would have wondered, and the next generations, and perhaps the permanent traditions of the world, would have handed his memory down with a vague and awful respect. But he has written what he spoke; and although it may not be (and is not) so exact an impress of his genius as was given to the hearer who saw his face and felt the vibrations of his voice, yet, allowing for this, we can still judge him by what he has left.

It was the gift of Lacordaire to feel, rather it should be said to see, with that exceptional gift which God had given him, that France was on the way to the truth. The future was very dark. Kings, nobles, ministers, bishops, clergy, and people had all their share in wrong-doing or in making mistakes, during the half-century that followed 1815. But Lacordaire believed that France was moving, and was moving in the right direction. He heard a sound, as he says, the sound of a people marching towards God by crooked and hidden paths; sometimes it seemed to be turning back and giving up the search; but it found the road again and went on. He saw, amidst the ruins of old things, the green blade of a new growth. He heard, amidst the madness of wild liberty, and the wailings of those who regretted a past order of things and the cynical sneers of materialist philosophy, the cry of a new generation that was beginning to feel how impossible it is to live without something to believe and something to worship. He felt that he had the power to speak to his age. Solitary, self-sufficing as he was, he was one who longed to sacrifice himself for the men of his time, and especially for the men of his nation. Once, glory had been his idol. After his conversion and his ordination, glory had given place to God, and, although during the first ten years of his priesthood he had never known rest or repose of mind, but had drifted from scheme to scheme and from hope to hope, yet he had never wavered in the conviction that he was truly called by God to sacrifice himself as a true priest. For ten years his mind had been full of trouble, of change, of error, of doubt. He had been on the

point of becoming a Jesuit; he had almost resolved to fix his residence in Poland; he had nearly started for America. He had lavished the first outpourings of his splendid mind in the pages of a daily journal, under the guidance of a genius whom he never thoroughly trusted; and the *Avenir*, the first medium between the thoughts of Lacordaire and the generation that he was burning to guide, had been condemned by the Holy See. His parting with La Mennais, at the age of thirty-two, is one of the heroic pages of his life. On that evening of the 11th of December, 1832, when he quitted La Chênaie, without even trusting himself to take leave of its master, La Mennais was still great and orthodox, and his position at Rome was excellent. But Lacordaire could not trust him. He had seen his temper, and had recognized whither his principles were leading. Still his heart was torn as he fled from a society that in many ways was so congenial to him. He left La Chênaie in the evening, after dinner, whilst La Mennais was walking up and down with his admiring circle. The fugitive could not help turning back to look. He saw, over the shrubbery, the master surrounded with his young disciples; he stopped, and looked for the last time on the "*malheureux grand homme.*" Then he continued his flight, not knowing what he was to do next, or of what value in God's sight was the act he was doing. He was overwhelmed in a sea of doubt and perplexity; what he had thought great, and fertile of great things, seemed to be dwindling into littleness and triviality. The ground seemed to be sinking under his feet, and he had to rally all his natural energy of character to keep off sheer despair.* But he was heroically faithful to the Church, and though his rupture with La Mennais tore his very heart, and laid him open to the wonder and the condemnation of the world, still he resolutely left him, and buried himself once more in that solitary life that allowed him to call his soul his own, and to act as his conscience and his keen intuition led him. He went back to his old post as chaplain to the Convent of the Visitation, in one of the narrow and winding streets then existing in the neighbourhood of the Jardin des Plantes. Here he lived, as he had lived before he had grown famous in the *Avenir*, alone with his mother, poor, reading Plato and S. Augustine, happy in his new peace, but still unsettled and anxious. He clung to his solitude and his "taciturnity" with an ardour that seems almost exaggeration. "Solitude," he writes to Montalembert, about this time, "solitude is my element, my life; to feel it forming round about me is joy and gladness . . . . Nothing can be done without solitude; that is my great axiom. The heart is sure to suffer loss when it pours itself out too often before

* "Testament," p. 72.

strangers, even though it keeps the mastery over itself; it is like a plant pulled up . . . . A man makes himself within himself, not outside of himself." For all this, Lacordaire had by no means the vocation of a recluse. All the time that he was shrinking from the world in his little room among his books, he never lost sight of the world altogether. A certain instinct of the future that was to be his lot, gleamed from time to time in his soul, like lightning at night, as Montalembert expresses it. He had dreams of writing a book; and he was preparing to preach; two things without which he said his life would not be complete. He had no clear idea, as yet, what his book was to be; he thought of something about the Church and the World in the nineteenth century. But he was in no hurry; he could wait. He was an energetic man, and naturally even a passionate man; but, like all the greatest men, he could control his abounding vitality in a perfect submission to his intellectual will. "Every man has his hour," he would say; "all he has to do is to wait, and do nothing against Providence." His hour was coming for him sooner than he had anticipated.

Yet his first public sermon in Paris was a failure. He preached at S. Roch. He had written his sermon, and he failed completely. The audience, as they went out, shook their heads and said: "He will never be a preacher." He thought as much himself. "I have not physical strength for it," he says; "I have not sufficient flexibility of mind; I do not understand the world; I have lived too solitary a life, and always shall; I shall never be a preacher, in the proper sense of the word. It is not the first time that I have discovered how little my mind sympathizes with an ordinary congregation. And then my voice is not strong enough for a church; and I should ruin my lungs in a very short time."* But at the very time he said this, he seemed to know that he would succeed; and, that he had his mission as a priest and an orator. "The young," he said, "seem to be more in my line; whenever I have spoken in a college chapel, I have done some good. . . . Perhaps some day I may be called to undertake a work which shall have for its object solely the young, and their benefit. . . . If ever I am to make my word useful to the Church, it will be in apology (*dans le genre apologétique*), that is, in that branch of oratory whose object is to bring together beauty, greatness, history, and religious controversy, and thus impart to the hearer a great idea of Christianity, and open the way to faith." He could hardly have defined better the peculiar apostleship to which God called him.

The "college chapel" in which Lacordaire first tried his gifts and felt his power, was the chapel of the *Collége Stanislas*,

* Letter to M. Lorain, May 6, 1833.

an institution founded under the Empire for the education of the highest classes of the Catholic youth of France. He had already spoken once or twice, with great effect, to the young auditory collected within its walls, when the Superiors proposed to him to give a course of Conferences. There was a great movement in Paris, just at that time, to establish Catholic Conferences. It seemed to be a necessity of the times. Jouffroy and other brilliant Rationalists were giving courses at the Sorbonne, in which the youth of Paris were presented with every sort of specious error on points of religion and morality. Ozanam, and the Society of S. Vincent de Paul, then just started, had been trying to get the Archbishop of Paris to establish some great scheme of Catholic teaching; and the Archbishop, Mgr. de Quélen, was actually taking measures to do something of the kind. Meanwhile Lacordaire accepted the offer of the Prefect of Studies of the Collége Stanislas. It was not the first time that the idea of this sort of work had occurred to him. He remembered well how in his own youth he had never been helped by hearing a Christian word. Once only, at the college at Dijon, he had been stirred by a few eloquent sentences; and ever since that time he had been possessed with the idea that if religion could be brought home to the young by a speaker at once competent and trusted, the effect would not be slight, notwithstanding the indifference of the world.* At his first Conference, there were present only the students and a few friends of the house. Next Sunday, the strangers were much more numerous. At the third Conference, a great part of the boys had to be sent out to make room for a throng of unexpected visitors. As the work went on, the little chapel was crowded more and more. Great men pushed their way in to listen: Chateaubriand, Berryer, Lamartine, Odilon-Barrot, Victor Hugo. The preaching was something new in Paris. There was a boldness, a novelty, a directness about it, that astonished not a few who had hitherto held sermons to be dry, hackneyed, and conventional. The speaker spoke for Catholic truth, yet he spoke a tongue that a lawyer, a politician, a student, any man of the world in short, might have used at the bar, or in the Chambers, or wherever topics of the day were to be discussed. During the three months that the conferences lasted, the crowd did not diminish; and thus, in Lacordaire's own words, was revealed to him his true vocation, "the apologetic teaching of religion from the pulpit."

But, as all the world now knows, the conferences of the Collége Stanislas were to be but the *tirocinium* of a grander work. We have dwelt upon these beginnings because the "Conference" was one great and distinguishing means by which Lacordaire influ-

* "Testament," p. 77.

enced his country, and it is important to understand the steps that led him to undertake them.

Mgr. de Quélen matured his plans for a systematic course of Catholic teaching in the beginning of the year 1834. On the 16th of February in that year he appeared in the pulpit of Notre Dame, and inaugurated what he called "a Lenten station on the fundamental truths of religion." He was to be followed by seven of the ablest preachers in Paris, who were to speak, in his presence, on the subjects he had given them.* It so happened that on the very day on which the Archbishop preached, Lacordaire was delivering his fifth Conference at the Stanislas. There was more in this than mere coincidence of time. It was a conflict. Mgr. de Quélen was by birth, by education, and by temperament a royalist and a Gallican of the moderate type of Gallicanism. He found it hard to understand his epoch. In 1834 he seemed to be about thirty years behind his age. He was afraid of disturbance, and would gladly let things be. He was a good deal afraid of Lacordaire, and of what people said about his style of preaching at the Stanislas. He wanted a sermon to be a sermon—solid, divided, eloquent, backed with quotations moderately warm, and without startling effects. He was fond of keeping to the beaten track; the old subjects and the old names, which had sufficed for the glorious traditions of the French pulpit for two hundred years, might surely suffice for him, and for his Lenten band of preachers; but to speak of the Gospel truths in the same breath with Liberty, Progress, and Saint-Simonism was rash and even profane. The result of these theories, as applied in the Lenten "station" of the year 1834, was, that the Archbishop and his seven preachers, who were all men of undoubted power, wrote each of them an excellent sermon, learnt it off, preached it—and the world seemed little the better. Meanwhile Lacordaire's Conferences came to an end in something like disgrace. He was accused on all sides of "novelty," in matter and in manner, of preaching revolution and anarchy. If we had no other account of these discourses, we could be certain they were striking and original from the mere history of the disturbance they caused among the old-school clergy. The whole story should be read in M. Foisset's volumes; we are not writing Lacordaire's life, so we must hasten to its catastrophe. In the very midst of the storm among the clergy, in the height of Lacordaire's own disappointment and sense of injury, at the moment when the Archbishop himself seemed too puzzled and frightened to do anything but keep things as they were, the Prelate, without a word of warning, offered to Lacordaire the pulpit of Notre Dame. It seemed

* The names of these preachers were MM. Dupanloup, Pététot, Jaunne, Annat Veyssière, d'Assance, and Thibault.

to be an inspiration. It had all the suddenness of one; but there is no doubt it must have seemed a tremendous risk to a man like Mgr. de Quélen. But it is a revelation of his real character. It shows that the prudent, patrician, Sulpician bishop had in him something of that rapid unerringness of decision that ever distinguishes the great man from the man that is merely commonplace. Lacordaire received the startling proposal without for a moment losing his presence of mind. He asked for twenty-four hours to think it over. Then, after having prayed to God, and consulted Madame Swetchine, he accepted the offer of the Archbishop.

It was at the beginning of the Lent of 1835 that Lacordaire commenced the first series of the Conferences of Notre Dame. He has left us, in his own words, a description of the opening of the first. It is a scene that will no doubt be long remembered. It may have the fate one day of passing among the common-places of French history. It was not the conquest of a nation to the Church, as when S. Rémi baptized Clovis. It was not the spectacle of a believing people rising in enthusiasm, as at the call of S. Bernard or of Peter the Hermit. It was not Bossuet declaiming to kings and nobles on the death of the great, or to splendid prelates on the Unity of the Church. There is something in Lacordaire's first appearance in Notre Dame that is as impressive to the thought as most of the scenes that live in the world's memory. It was the religion of Jesus Christ asserting itself to the nineteenth century. It is quite possible for the Church to exist, in this or that country, without asserting herself. In the person of Lacordaire she rose from the attitude of sufferance, of timidity, of waiting for kings and watching for ministers, and confronted, on her own merits and with her own resources, the demands, the prejudices, and the indifference of a generation that seemed to have ceased to take her into account. The six thousand men, of all shades of opinion,—republican, absolutist, clerical, anti-clerical, idle, curious, friendly, hostile,—that filled the great nave of Notre Dame on that day were not so much a congregation as a public. The Archbishop sitting there with his head slightly bent, still and motionless, like a man who was not a mere spectator and not a judge, but who ran a serious personal risk in the event, was the type of the large and powerful section of the clergy who were afraid of the new ideas, and yet more afraid of speaking face to face with the free-spoken crowd that held them. And the orator, outwardly so calm, inwardly filled with emotion, who commenced with his look fixed on his bishop, but whom the inspiration of that great audience was fast transforming and raising up, was at once the advanced guard and the most accomplished warrior of an army of speakers and writers who have since carried the standard of Catholic thought into every position where philosophy, or science, or literature has

seemed to challenge the attempt. The battle that he gained on that day was more than an oratorical triumph. It was a presage, a prophetic augury, that had effects far wider than the immediate field of victory. The now historical "cry" that burst from his lips, as his breast dilated under the necessity of seizing the vast assembly, might be the watch-word of all the great French Catholics during the thirty years since it was uttered. The Bishop shook and grew visibly pale at the sudden and loud apostrophe; but as he raised his head for a moment and looked at the speaker, he may have seen that the audience had been shaken too, and as he surrendered himself once for all to the power of the speaker, the old traditional school of French clericalism surrendered with him.*

The Conferences of Lacordaire represent best the work which he undertook and the effect which he produced. Now that they exist in a collected form, ready for every reader, they constitute an imposing monument that will keep his name alive for ever. But it is not as a book, as a legacy left to future generations, that these great discourses claim our admiration. It was the actual delivery of them, the living voice of the orator ringing through the vaults of crowded cathedrals, his splendid presence in the face of thousands of cultivated men in every part of France, that really wrought what their author meant them to work—the restoration of religion to a place in the thought of the age. For two successive years (1835—1836) he held the pulpit of Notre Dame, and men went to hear him as they went to hear the great thinkers of the day—a Victor Cousin, a Jouffroy, a Royer-Collard. After an interval of seven years, he again appeared at Notre Dame, now in the habit of his Dominican profession. Every year from 1843 to 1851 saw him regularly at his post. Thus was founded the great work of the Conferences of Notre Dame. But he did more than this. There were few of the great towns of France in which he did not preach a "station" either during the Advent or during the Lent. He had a fixed idea, at least as early as 1837,† of creating "a system of teaching which at present does not exist." He wished to see every cathedral in the country with its pulpit for this special teaching. He considered that this was the particular requirement of an epoch "when the young are never taught their religion and yet are full of anxiety to learn it." For this purpose he travelled up and down France, and lavished his eloquence and his earnestness on assemblies in every province from the Rhine to the Pyrenees. Metz, Nancy, Grenoble, Strasbourg, Toulon, Liége, Dijon, Bour-

* The "cry" to which allusion is here made has been preserved. "Assemblée, assemblée, que me demandez-vous? Que voulez-vous de moi? la vérité? . . . . Vous ne l'avez pas donc en vous! Vous la cherchez donc, vous voulez la recevoir; vous êtes venus ici pour être enseignés."

† Letter to Madame Swetchine, p. 152.

deaux, Toulouse, are some of the provincial towns where he gave courses and instituted the "work of the Conferences." The uniform and complete success that attended his words, the conversions that followed, the improvement in the tone of rationalist journalism and of society generally on the subject of religion, and the increased confidence and new energy of the clergy—effects which, as was to be expected, were more evident in the provinces than in the capital—prove the wisdom of his views, and raise his work to the dignity of an apostleship.

It is not an easy task to appreciate fairly the Conferences of Lacordaire; and it now becomes our duty to attempt this. The difficulty of the task arises chiefly from the fact that they have been so successful. When a man passes from cold to heat, he feels the shock and can estimate it; but when the new state has become normal with him, his sensations are inactive, and he has to question a memory that will be sure to find a difficulty in going back to the situation, and will probably overlook some of its most important conditions. Lacordaire and his fellow-labourers and successors have created an atmosphere, and we breathe it. If we had stood beside them when the conflict was going on, we should have felt its vicissitudes and experienced its progress; but as it is, we seem to be too much accustomed to what has been gained to feel precisely what it is. Moreover, Lacordaire has been so fully written about, analysed, and described by such writers as Montalembert, De Broglie,* Père Chocarne, M. Lorain, M. Foisset, and, not least, by himself, that it is next to impossible to say anything about him that has not been better said already, unless one were to undertake to find out faults.

What is true of most orators is true in a special manner of Lacordaire—that it was his audience that made him what he showed himself to be. He had an insight, and a far-seeing energy of mind that refused to be contented with an ordinary congregation. As he failed in his first "sermon" at S. Roch, so to the end of his life he could not endure to preach an ordinary sermon, single and detached. He required room, both figuratively and physically, to speak in. He loved the sight of a vast crowd, and the feeling that it belonged to him for the day, and the next day, and days after that. The audience that made his imagination glow and his intellect widen, was a solemn, unusual thronging together of men,—men who could think and understand,—men who came from so many quarters, and represented so many classes, that the crowd round his pulpit was France in miniature. This was the congregation that thrilled his sympathies, because he knew it and its wants. It was his country, and its wants were the wants

* M. de Broglie's "appreciation" of his friend is, perhaps, the very best of all. It is partly quoted in Foisset, i. 335.

of his country in the nineteenth century. And it was these assemblies of men, representing to him nothing less than all France, that dictated his themes, that made him look out so zealously for the words that he knew they wanted, and that drew from his heart the lightning with which those words were winged. His audience was a novel one, and it had in it elements of grandeur and excitement never before collected together. It was the first time, since the nations of Europe had received the faith, that a preacher of Jesus Christ had preached to a wide European public of unbelievers. Great saints and missionaries had never been wanting to raise their voices against sin and corruption, and the heresies that rose from time to time, especially those of the sixteenth century, had been the occasion of many fervent invectives and successful exhortations. But the hearers of Lacordaire were beyond mere controversy and out of the pale of moral teaching. To find a parallel to that generation that had sprung up during the depressed period of the Church's vitality which had followed the Revolution, and that looked back to the times before the Revolution only to find Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Voltaire, we should have to go back to Alexandria in the third century. Lacordaire, like Clement, spoke to a people that knew not the faith ; that had got hold of many ideas that were good and true ; and that were full of the conviction that the Gospel of Jesus Christ was retrograde and ineffectual. Both spoke at a time when intellects were active and when minds were eagerly inquiring for truth. In Alexandria the stir of intellect was natural to a city that had been wealthy for many generations,—a city where the West met the East, and where a great school and great traditions of learning drew scholars from every quarter. In France the cessation of the whirl and din of a great storm had made a sort of silence in the air, and men were reflecting upon the mighty phenomena they had seen—on the gains and the losses, on the changes of landmarks, on the unmasking of falsehoods, on the wrecks and the warnings that such a time had left. Yet in many things they were different from any Pagan generation that had ever been. They were unbelievers, but faith was amongst them, and was at work. Faith was amongst them in the persons of the hierarchy of the Church, who lived and moved, if they did not push on and attack. Faith was amongst them in the very education and use of their senses. It was something that the soil was not covered with Pagan temples, that civil and social life were not interwoven with Pagan worship, and that common speech was not a vehicle for a seductive mythology. It was much more that the language of France was still the language of St. Bernard and of Bossuet, that the forms of justice, the institutions of marriage, the solemn moments of man's birth and of his departure, though the attempt had been made to paganize

them, yet seemed to the public eye to call for religion to contribute to them something which they lacked. Lacordaire, therefore, in spite of the distance between his hearers and the faith, had a common ground with them. It was not the common ground that was between the missioner and the sinner in the ages of faith; it was not even that on which stood the Catholic controversialist and the loud-voiced reformer in the times of the great religious outbreak. But still, such as it was, it was common ground; and it was wide enough to enable the apologist and his public to stand face to face. If all did not believe in God, or in Providence, yet many had clinging to them dumb echoes of a revelation that perhaps had spoken to them in childhood, or, since then, in some of the many ways that a country's old traditions do speak for ages after their voice seems hushed. Their ideas on the great moral truths were violently distorted; but their morality, after all, was above the morality of the Pagan world, and the tide of Christianity that seemed to have receded from them had not failed to leave behind it some of its fertility. Though they had rejected their Teacher, or had never known Him, they had not lost all the lessons that He had taught. They had ideas, not all wrong, of the good, the beautiful, and the true. They could understand what self-denial meant. They knew what it was to seek truth. They had an awakening respect for order, at the very time that their talk was of liberty, of charters, of equality. The State, if it were to stand, must rest on certain rational principles; and any one who rejected these principles was a mere firebrand of revolution and anarchy. Civil society would corrupt unless there were such a thing as men called virtue, to preserve honesty and to control passion. The family, the root and foundation of all national strength and greatness, would decay (and with it the nation) unless there was some powerful agent to make husbands and wives love and help each other, and some teaching with which they might bring up their children in wisdom and strength. In short, there was a difference between man and the brutes he drove or fought against, and the difference was expressed by such words as virtue, honesty, self-denial, mutual love, gentleness, refinement, progress, and perfectibility. This was the ground upon which Lacordaire set down his foot. It was not new to him. He had studied it well, and mapped it all out. Nay, he had done better (or worse), for he had been all over it himself. To speak about it, he had nothing to do, as he says, but to use his memory and to listen to the far-off echoes of his own consciousness. "He was one who had come out of this new world; nay, people said that it still had its attractions for him. He had shared its illusions; he would surely be able to understand its cries, and to heal the malady that was hardly known to its ownself."*

* M. de Broglie, quoted in Foisset, i. 332.

Armed with this profound knowledge, he stood before the hearers he had called around him, and presented to their view a series of brilliant pictures, which he called Christianity. He did not trouble them much with abstract philosophy. He did not try to prove by metaphysics that there was a God, or that man had an immortal soul. This had been tried before, and the records of French preaching would have given him a hundred elegant and unimpeachable demonstrations of such great truths—demonstrations which would have been to his generation (as perchance they often were to their own) but as the charged coils of the electric battery before some deft hand has touched a point and made the chain complete. From Bourdaloue down to Frayssenoits, proof had been abundant; it was only persuasion that was wanting. Neither did Lacordaire rest his cause on history. He knew how to use history; but he ransacked it for scenes rather than for proofs. He seldom or never quoted the early historians of the Church. It was not in his route to prove the authenticity of the Bible or the condemnation of a heresy by the Church, or the orthodoxy of a Pope, or the antiquity of a doctrine. His plan was simple. He bade people open their eyes and look. There was a phenomenon, living, palpable, present among men for so many centuries; let them look at it in any way they pleased, whether in regard to intellect, or to morality, or to society, the Catholic Church was a phenomenon that was unique on earth; and it was therefore divine, for if human it would never have continued to be this one phenomenon, the greatest that has ever been naturalized in the world, the greatest intellectually, the greatest morally, the greatest socially.* Facts or phenomena, made evident, made to stand out, solid and coloured, before the very sense, by the words of genius,—these are the themes of the Conferences of Lacordaire. To exemplify by one instance (out of a hundred that offer themselves) at once the matter of the preacher and the "phenomenal" nature of his appeal, we will translate an extract from his ninth Conference, that on the subject of Tradition. The reader will observe how the theme stands out, stereoscopically, so to speak; and how at the same time the electric communication is made between the speaker and his actual audience. It is a real audience, not a formal or customary congregation. It has good qualities which rouse the orator's love and zeal; it has living ideas that must be put right before it leaves his presence. The voice that speaks is a voice of the day and of the hour, not an echo of accents, however noble, that have been used before:—

A priest! Did you ever consider with yourselves how hard it is to conceive a priest? Have you ever made it clear to yourselves, not how it is there

* "Conférences sur Jésus-Christ," i., p. 193.

have always been so many priests and are so many at this moment, but how it is there is a single one? I pity the man who meditates on the priest, and is not struck by the fact that he exists. What is a priest? Is he a man who looks after morality, an officer in charge of morals, as the eighteenth century used to say? But where is there, outside of Christianity, any morality for the priest to take charge of? What was the morality administered by the Pontiffs of Greece and of Rome? Is the priest a philosopher? But the philosopher is the priest's mortal enemy. Is he a class of public functionary? Why, if all the sovereigns of Europe and of the world were to join in making a priest, they would only succeed in making a man whom people would laugh at and despise. In this capital there are statesmen, wits, poets, orators, artists; I beg of them to meet and make a priest! They will see! One day, in the time of the French Republic, one of the chiefs of the Government presented himself in a temple, clothed in a white robe with a blue cincture, and carrying in his hand a vase of flowers, which he proceeded to offer to the Supreme Being, the founder of the Republic. In itself, the act was simple and reasonable enough; what was there to hinder a magistrate, clothed in solemn robes, from offering to God one of the purest and loveliest things of creation, a bouquet of flowers? Nevertheless, the man was crushed under the ridicule he received. He had done a priest's act, without having received sacerdotal transfiguration, without having been raised to the ineffable priestly state. What is this priest—this man who owes his existence neither to morality, nor to philosophy, nor to the State, nor to the world—this man whom no one can make, and yet who is everywhere—what is he? The priest is a man *anointed by tradition to shed blood*, not like the soldier, in valour,—not like the magistrate, in justice,—but like Jesus Christ, in love; the priest is the man of sacrifice, by sacrifice each day reconciling heaven and earth, and by sacrifice each day announcing to every soul the great truths of life, death, and resurrection. Yes, and that is the reason, why you, sons of the eighteenth century as you are, fed on the pride of the ages you live in—that is the reason why, a few minutes ago, when priestly hands raised on high the sacred host, you were seized with involuntary reverence, and bowed your heads by an impulse which I trust that God will not forget.

To look through the titles of his Conferences, as we have them in the edition that he himself put forth, is to trace out the proportions of a mighty work. "The Church" was his first subject. The seven discourses which he consecrated to it in the year 1835, contain the first flowers and fruits of his genius. In later works he may have gone deeper and spoken at times more grandly; but there is an energy, a sort of joyous force in these, as of a giant trying his strength, that, it seems to us, is not met with again. Let the reader refer to the "scenic" description of the situation of Rome, in the fourth Conference; or the splendid peroration of the same discourse, on the triumph of the Holy See; or the "Entre nous et vous, Messieurs," of the fifth; or "Oh! oui, pauvre âme blessée par le mal!" in the same; and the naïve little apologue of the two Lions and the Lamb, in the sixth, with which he stepped down

from the pulpit, seems thrown off in the very exuberance of a fancy that two hours of close debate could not fatigue. In the following year, 1836, he consecrated his six Lenten discourses to the "Doctrine of the Church: its Nature and its Sources." They show rather less splendour of thought than those of the preceding year: but their reasoning and analysis are more profound. Lacordaire seems, in this series, to be so sure of his audience, that he is not afraid of leading them into some deep speculations. On the subject of "Reason," he gets upon his firmest ground—the defects of man's state, and his need of something divine. On "Faith" he cannot be said to be altogether as happy as usual. Much of his brilliant and pointed language on "natural faith" is not far from being paradoxical; and the quality of supernatural faith is nowhere clearly defined. Grand passages of eloquence occur here, as elsewhere. There is one paragraph, however, the illustration of the "author and his book," in the Conference on "Scripture," which is decidedly below the level of Lacordaire. But his general method of treating the somewhat difficult subject of "Scripture," is an admirable example of the vivacity and force with which he can seize the imaginative powers whilst informing and leading the intellect.

It was seven years before he again entered the pulpit of Notre Dame. During these years he had thought much, seen much, and passed through many experiences. He was now a Religious. Resuming the thread of his plan, he dedicated the winter of 1843-4 to the subject of the "*Effects* of the Church's Doctrine on Man's Intellect." He spoke at a moment when there was going on what seemed to be a complete resurrection of Catholic public life. Montalembert in the Chambers, Charles Lenormant and Ozanam in their Professors' chairs, Mgr. Parisis from his episcopal see, Dupanloup, Veuillot, and others in their several spheres; in a word, the whole Church of France had begun to let the country know that there was a Catholic question. They demanded Liberty. These Conferences bear traces of this great movement, in the number of their political allusions, and in their appeals to the "people." To appeal to the people was unknown in the French pulpit. In the eyes of a large section of the French clergy it was simply to approve revolution. Yet Lacordaire told the people that they had a "passion for religion;" not religion such as "their masters" offered them, a mere fetter to keep them quiet; but religion as the requirement of their nature, and their elevation to communion with God. He told them that they were not to disturb themselves about the wordy disputes of learned men; they had a shorter and a surer way of learning the truth. He reminded his "brother, the workman," that he was the brother, the child, the friend of God, who had come from heaven for him, and given His blood for him. These were agitating words to some who heard them—some of the older clergy, gentlemen, and

legitimists as they were, who remembered how this same "people" had guillotined their fathers and mothers; and who now sat in the stalls of Notre Dame and heard a priest thus take their part.

The next winter, 1844-45, produced the Conferences on the "Effect of Catholic Doctrine on Man's Actions." For the first time Lacordaire attacked the practical side of doctrine. Many of his critics had thought, or said, that he was a visionary who could propound views that never made a sinner good, or a just man better. This was an absurd criticism, considering his aims and his audience. But these beautiful lectures on humility, chastity, brotherly love, and sanctity, were sufficient to show that he could effectually lash vice, and call souls to virtue. The Conference on Sanctity is, perhaps, one of the most strikingly original in idea that Lacordaire himself has ever delivered. The station of this year is remarkable as being entirely free from any allusion to the political situation. But, besides the usual eloquence, there is no lack of memorable and vivacious portraiture and description; as, for instance, the picture of Luther in the third discourse. We are presented with the man "who conceived the idea of reforming us;" the monk, the genius, the writer, the orator—he was well furnished for his work; "laissons-le faire son œuvre!" . . . "Il a fini, Messieurs!" —and where do we find him again? Not at the sacred hearth of a cenobitic tent; but at the fireside of a vulgar house, stretching out his legs before a domestic fire, and with a wife at his side! A companion portrait is that of the English missionary, doing his apostleship by writing. "In the nook of his fireside, all the measures of the *comfortable* being perfectly taken," (to change the phrase would be to spoil it) "the door carefully shut, the windows exactly closed, *un gentleman* takes up his pen; he reflects at his ease between his breakfast and his supper, he writes his pages, he pays for the printing, but takes care that his publisher pays *him*, and the publisher in his turn pays the *colporteur*, who, in the last resort, is really the only one who performs the part of an apostle." He gives a sketch of Erasmus in a similar spirit; but Erasmus is best given in a single phrase, when he introduces him as "the first academician of his day." An audience that could appreciate the quiet *esprit* of such episodes as these, could never find the speaker dull, or his themes uninteresting.

The Conferences on "Society," and its relations with Catholic doctrine (1845), introduced the always crowded auditory of Notre Dame to a new class of subjects. So far he had spoken of the message of Christianity to the individual soul; now he was to consider what it had done and could do for humanity in that union of intellects, ends, and acts which is called Society. We recognize here, once more, a ground-theme, so to speak, of Lacordaire. As he delighted in bidding man open his eyes and

look at the living answer to all his soul's doubts, the remedy for all his weakness, and the indefinite elevation of all his littleness, so he could enter into the idea of "man organized," and show with infinite breadth of thought and splendour of illustration how the machine of the world must stop and break down without religion. He showed how there could be no intellectual foundation for society—no unchanging, fundamental, freely-accepted body of truth—except such as Christianity taught. He is unusually magnificent, in the third Conference, on the "phenomenon" of the Church's Catholicity—on her universal expansion so far and so wide in spite of distance, physical barriers, climate, and race. In point of eloquence this is one of his finest Conferences. In his exposition of the influence of Christianity in matter of "law and right," he travels, perhaps, out of the depth of an ordinary Englishman; but his French audience could follow him; he was really reading them a lecture on the "rights of man." But few things that he has ever done are more masterly than his treatment of the enormously difficult question of "Property," and even more delicate subject of "Authority." Every great genius is in advance of his age. It seems to us that the principles laid down by Lacordaire in the fifth, seventh, and eighth of these Conferences on Society have not yet been taken up by the teaching world or assimilated by the world that is taught.

The orator concluded his station of 1845 by a solemn invitation to his hearers to meet him in the following year, and hear him speak to them on no less a subject than Jesus Christ. And at the commencement of his opening discourse of 1846 he apostrophizes the sacred name that is to be his new theme.

> Lord Jesus! during the ten years that I have spoken to these hearers concerning your Church, it is really of you that I have ever spoken; but now at length I arrive more immediately at yourself—at that divine figure which is every day the object of my contemplation, at your sacred feet that I have kissed so many times, at your loving hands that have so often blessed me, at your head crowned with glory and with thorns, at that life whose perfume I have breathed since my birth, which my youth knew not, which my manhood found again, which my ripening age adores and announces to every creature. Father! Master! Friend! Jesus! be my helper more than ever! I am near thee now, and they must feel that I am, and the words of my mouth must be filled with the odour of thy presence!

The Conferences on "Jesus Christ" are to general readers perhaps the best known of any of Lacordaire's works. There is a sustained loftiness, grandeur, and solidity about them, due, no doubt, partly to the subject, but partly also to the ripening powers of the great orator. There is more real effective *work* in this series than in those that have gone before. The exposition of the excellences

and beauties of Christianity in preceding years had been as admirable as it was important; but there was necessarily a kind of vagueness and a suspicion of declamation clinging to such transcendental themes. But to pronounce the name of Jesus Christ was to narrow the contest within very exciting limits. If that name failed to conquer, all the battle was lost. Lacordaire does not content himself with holding up Jesus Christ as a phenomenon that proves its divine character by its presence and its adaptation to the needs of humanity; he does all this, but the question is here too practical to be left either to the unsteady operation of a magnificent major premiss, or to the unstable impulses of an aroused enthusiasm. He therefore proves Jesus Christ. His scriptural proof is thorough and complete. He combines the textual matter of a Perrone with the emotional handling of a S. Bernard. He groups his arguments from post-scriptural history with an effect that we naturally expect from one whose genius was nowhere brighter than in transcribing the great facts of the world and illuminating them with its own moral radiance. It is somewhat unexpected that on a subject which was naturally so well calculated to touch the heart, the orator should have so seldom allowed his feelings to be seen, or indulged in those pathetic outbursts of which he possessed the secret. Probably the matter was too solemn and the question too critical. In addition to the few words of prayer which have been given above, there is, it may be said, only one passage where the heart seems really to pour itself out, and even there the speaker seems to apologize for a warmth that he had scarcely been able to control. It is the famous passage in the third Conference, commencing "Il y a un homme dont l'amour garde la tombe,"—probably most of the schoolboys in France would be able to say it by heart. Montalembert was present at the delivery of this Conference, and he has left on record the accent of despair that the orator threw into his voice when, in the picture of the instability of earthly affections, he pronounced the words that occur just before those we have cited—the words that prepare the way for the transition from man's love to that of Jesus Christ—"C'est fini, à jamais fini!" "I remember still," says his friend, "I remember it even now with a thrill of my whole body."*

* The similarity between the audience that listened to Lacordaire and that for which Clement of Alexandria wrote and spoke has already been mentioned. The "Exhortation to the Gentiles" of Clement is a series of conferences on Jesus Christ; and so is the first book of the *Pædagogus*. There are many passages in the two illustrious apologists that would almost bear verbal comparison; compare, for instance, Lacordaire's outburst of eloquence on "the God of the people" (Le peuple avait un Dieu dans le ciel, &c.—Conf. 4), with the equally eloquent, though not equally touching, passage in which Clement exalts the "Word of God" above the lyre of Amphion, Sion above Helicon, and the music of the works of the Word, the grand hymn of

The next time that Lacordaire ascended the pulpit of Notre Dame was three days after the revolution of February, 1848. Royalty had been chased away, and the disturbances had begun, had calmed down, but had by no means ended. Yet the Church was strong enough to open her doors to all the world, and the Archbishop of Paris feared not to sit in his official state to listen to a priest and a monk preaching on the lofty theme of "God." The eight Conferences of this eventful year are full of allusions to those "days of great and memorable emotions." All readers of Lacordaire will remember them—the solemn address of thanks to the Archbishop for his firmness; the appeal at the end of the first discourse, to God, "the Judge of kings and arbiter of the world;" the prayer that He would propitiously regard "this ancient people of France, the eldest son of His right hand, and of His Church;" the thrilling words that recalled the crucifix which the revolutionary mob had carried with respect from the Tuileries to S. Roch; the allusion to the "disappearance" of a monarchy and the epoch of reconstruction; and, more perilous than these, the rebuke of the revolution and the suggestion that over the words "Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité," which had been solemnly set up in the public places of Paris, they should write those other words which were quite as much needed: "Obéissance, Hiérarchie, Vénération." The Conferences had been prepared at a time when the preacher could not have guessed that the storm was so near at hand, and their subject which seemed to belong to the highest flights of speculative theology, seemed also to demand an audience of divines or philosophers, rather than a body of young men full of the excitement of a bloody revolution. Yet never was Lacordaire more interesting or more "actual." It is true that we are here presented with specimens—we may say the first specimens—of his power of theological exposition, a power he has shown elsewhere, and not least in a wonderful letter (among those to Madame Swetchine) on the consequences of original sin.† The Conference on the Trinity is one of those powerful cries that one human reason sometimes utters to other human reasons—cries full of lofty remonstrance with those

---

the creation and adornment of this world, of man's formation and redemption, of the soul's regeneration and elevation, above all that moving of the rocks and forests and drawing of the beasts that the fable ascribed to the skill of the Theban. And the "hymn of Christ the Saviour," which concludes the *Pædagogus*,—a hymn whose matter and whose form are both older than Clement—in which the devotion of a pious heart to Christ is expressed in such curious lyric phrase, bears some resemblance to such a passage as the end of the third Conference, where the preacher forgets his rationalist hearers and pours forth his faith as he recalls a Corpus Christi day at Rome; "My Master and my King! the immortal King of Souls! *Christus vincit! Christus regnat!* Children of Christ, happy you!"

† Correspondence, p. 328.

who make limited horizons for themselves, and see contradiction where there is only mystery. But the greater part of the eight discourses are concerned rather with man than with God—rather with creation than with the Creator. How far the circumstance of the hour made him alter his plans at the last moment, it is impossible to say, but it is certain that there is nothing more practical and nothing more full, even to imprudence, of sympathy with popular thought than the Conferences on God. That splendid picture, in the fifth Conference, of Truth turning upon its oppressors and taking its vengeance; of the day "when kings grow pale and kingdoms are disturbed, when it is night in Babylon, and Baltassar sees the hand, and the sword of Cyrus waits not for the morrow," needed not to have had its moral pointed with the words that follow: "Open your eyes—we are in Babylon, and we assist at Baltassar's feast." It was true enough that the time was fertile in great lessons, and that the age was playing a "rôle vengeur;" but it was hardly the moment to say so, and a pulpit was not the place to say it. Still there is no want of solid power in the Conferences. Besides the theology they contain, there are profound and suggestive ideas on materialism ("*cette canaille de doctrine*"), on scepticism, on free-will, on labour, and on similar subjects; and the confidence and joyous hope in the future of France, of which Lacordaire was full, in spite of, or perhaps on account of, the terrible events that were taking place in that ever-remembered year, are easily seen in many turns of phrase and sonorous perorations. "La France le fera! Oui, mon Dieu, la France le fera! Nous en avons l'augure dans le respect qu'elle vous porte au milieu des ruines qu'elle vient si soudainement d'accomplir." (Conf. the eighth.) If his enthusiastic expectation was destined to be but slightly realized, the same can be said of the words of the wisest of men when they try to divine the future course of the decrees of God.

The Conferences of 1849, 1850, and 1851, may be passed over briefly. Yet they show no falling off in real power. They are, perhaps, less striking than the discourses of his younger days; but a great public teacher, after he has made for himself an audience, and when his hair is beginning to turn grey, naturally grows to think more of his subject than of his hearers. He has no longer to render them "attentive and benevolent;" rather it is they who press near him and wait for the privilege of listening to his words. In 1849, the subject was the "supernatural,"—God's communion with man by Revelation and grace. In 1850 he was occupied with the "fall and the redemption of man." The discourses in this series—"The First Man;" "Trial;" "Temptation;" "Fall;" "Redemption;" are models of the half-meditative, half-historical style which Lacor-

daire could use so well. He presents the story of Scripture, yet he sets it in such a framework of imaginative philosophy that it seems to be the story of the life of him who listens. The difficult subject of the "transmission of the Fall," cannot, perhaps, be clearly explained to an audience unskilled in theology; but if any reader cares to see a most suggestive treatment of the idea of "Solidarity," he may profitably study the sixth Conference of the series. In 1851, just after having fought (and won) an annoying contest in Rome, he closed his Conferences of Notre Dame with the seven on Providence and the Distribution of Grace. "Dieu dans l'histoire," is a theme on which we know beforehand, we may expect striking and grand thoughts. The concluding Conference will always be remarkable for the splendid and touching peroration in which he takes leave of his audience and of the walls of Notre Dame.

The series of six Conferences which he delivered at Toulouse in the early part of the year 1854, were meant by their author to be the first instalment of a new plan, for the completion of which he would require six or seven years. As it has turned out, they hold the melancholy position of being the last that he ever gave. To many readers they will seem to be the best. If ever Lacordaire recalled Bossuet in the pulpit, he has done so here. He is always striking and always new, but here he attains the dignity and restraint of perfect art. Clap-trap, vulgarity, and bad taste are as seldom to be met with in him as in any original genius, in the act of striking his impress upon his age; but their traces quite disappear in these exquisite lectures on life, passion, and holiness, uttered in that pulpit in which his Father S. Dominic had preached to the faithful of Gascony and Languedoc six hundred years before.

Such were the subjects on which Lacordaire continued to speak to what we may call the French nation for twenty years. As we have said, it was an apostleship; and it is no doubt that it was an apostleship that was blessed with success. One who heard his first Conferences at Notre Dame and lived to preach his funeral sermon, Mgr. de la Bouillerie, bishop of Carcassonne, spoke of his work in these words: "Now, every year, under the vaulted roof of the metropolitan church of Paris, thousands of men come on Easter-day, and kneel at the holy table. Ask them who made them Christians. Many will tell you that the first spark that enkindled their faith was the fire that fell from this man." And Lacordaire himself, on leaving for Rome in 1836, that is, after his second series of Conferences, said: "I was grieved at having to leave all these young men, many of whom have shown me such confidence and attachment. I regretted this *rising flock*.* And, later on, he

* Letter to Madame Swetchine, 2nd May, 1836.

wrote thus: "Hitherto my life had passed in study and in controversy; by the Conferences I entered into the apostleship. . . . It was at Notre Dame, at the foot of my pulpit, that I saw the rise of that attachment of which no natural quality can be the source, and which binds the convert to the apostle by ties whose sweetness is as much from God as their strength. I do not know all those souls thus attached to mine by memories of *conversion* or confirmation. I am still receiving every day proofs that it is so, proofs so lively as to astonish me."* It would be too long to examine and seek for the fruits of each of his stations in detail; but a few examples may be given, chiefly from those in the provinces. Metz, where he preached in the Lent of 1838, was a military town, where there were soldiers with their free lives, a large number of Protestants, and a considerable party of rationalists and extreme republicans. We are told † that it is difficult, almost impossible, to conceive the degree to which Catholics in the provinces were "enveloped and, as it were, buried" in the fall of Charles X.; how utterly they were treated as conquered and suspected wretches; into what a state of *individualism*, of isolation, they had fallen. At Metz, the crowds that rushed to hear Lacordaire were what we are accustomed to when he preached. This single fact is of itself a success. Catholics were once more equals and citizens. Moreover, numerous conversions followed; the principal was that of General de Marguerie, but it appears certain that there were other notable ones. But the great work of Lacordaire at Metz (and considering the state of things to which allusion has been made, it certainly was a great work) was to found a Conference of S. Vincent de Paul. The influence over public opinion which this implies need not be insisted upon.

The conversions which he made at Strasbourg, at the Lenten station of 1846, are the subject of his surprise and gratitude. "Nowhere," he said, "have I met with greater sympathy, with warmer hearts, with a greater number of kind people — and nowhere have I reaped greater apostolic fruit."‡ At Bordeaux, in the winter of 1841-42, he roused the whole city to an enthusiasm which made his Conferences the single topic of the season. He no sooner left the pulpit than he was engaged in private interviews. He reconciled many Protestants with the Church. During the Holy Week, the law of abstinence was observed even in the great hotels. And Cardinal Donnet, twenty years afterwards (12th July, 1862), wrote thus: "The effects produced by this preaching were immense and *lasting*. Public opinion in Bordeaux changed from that moment. The churches are more

* Notice. † Foisset, i. 423.

‡ Letter to Madame de la Tour du Pui, 15th May, 1846. Quoted by Foisset, ii. 112.

frequented; the Easter duties are generally fulfilled." Finally, it will be interesting to many to know that M. Auguste Nicolas is a native of Bordeaux, and that the *Études philosophiques sur le Christianisme*, a work which has run through nineteen editions and wrought numberless conversions, was partly the fruit of Lacordaire's encouragements, was introduced to the world by a notice from his pen, and owed much of its success to the "religious emotion" which his words had spread abroad in the ancient city. It has often been said that Lacordaire converted no one. This is far from being true. But the assertion, as implying any discredit to the orator, is quite beside the mark. Lacordaire, as a *Conférencier*, did not aim directly at conversions. As we have seen, he had a far more fundamental work to accomplish. He had to make conversions possible. He undertook to attract the attention and respect of a people who had turned their backs in contempt upon the Catholic Church. To prepare souls for the faith, is the object he proposed to himself. The faith had been weakened in France by sixty years of pestilent literature; it was now trying to revive; it needed the *shake* of a friendly voice.* He was what he somewhere calls Chateaubriand, "*le premier hérault du bon Dieu*" to France. As P. Chocarne very well says, it may be admitted, if it be insisted upon, that he never converted any one; it is enough for us that he converted public opinion.

That there must have been something really extraordinary about discourses that produced such effects, that raised such enthusiasm, that wrought such blessed changes, and also that provoked so much opposition and irritation, need not be insisted upon. It is more difficult to say in what precise thing they so far excelled as to seize so thoroughly the attention of the world. His audiences were such as no French preacher had had before. But what made his audiences, and what held them at the foot of his pulpit for twenty years? Divine grace was visiting France in those days; that cannot be doubted: but we are here rather speaking of the human instrument of grace. The subjects of which he spoke were most important and interesting; but no one needs to be told that a subject alone never made a successful speaker. We are obliged to turn to the man himself, and to the power of genius incarnate,† so to speak, in his words.

Lacordaire was an orator. Whatever superstition there may be among those who believe in adages, that orators are formed and not made, he was a born orator. It is not merely that he used to try to preach from his very infancy; though it is related that, in the little toy-chapel that they had made him, he would make

* Preface to the Conferences, 5.

† It is Wordsworth's expression that "style is the incarnation of thought.'

sermons to his nurse with such vehemence that they feared he would hurt himself, and that when only eight years old he used to read Bourdaloue with a window for a pulpit, imitating as well as he could the gestures and manners of preachers whom he had seen. His brilliant feats of improvisation at the meetings of a literary society at Dijon, when he was twenty-three years of age, are commemorated in his Life.* But without knowing any of these details, and with scarcely any guide but his printed works, we could tell he was an orator by nature. The orator, as distinguished from the writer, must above all things aim at immediate effect. The conditions under which he makes his attempts at persuasion are clearly defined for him. He has a limited audience, his own gifts are of such or such a nature, but, above all, he has only the brief span of his hour of speech, and the contracted range and fleeting accents of his own living voice. He must, therefore, study effect in a way to which the writer, with permanent print, unlimited time, and an indefinite public, is by no means confined. If the orator fails here and now, he fails absolutely. Knowing this, it is his duty, even if it is also sometimes his temptation, to be striking as much as to be profound, and to provide for the effect of the truth as much as for the truth of the effect. In every page that Lacordaire has left we seem to see him in the tribune or the pulpit, speaking, so to say, to the eyes of men. He does not pretend to carry on long trains of reasoning; his audience could not follow them He does not attempt to reproduce Aristotle or S. Thomas. When he does enter the region of metaphysics (which, notwithstanding sundry disclaimers, he does pretty frequently), it is rather to seek views than to prove conclusions; it is rather to analyze ideas than to look for reasons. Perhaps there is nothing in which he innovated so much, at least in the French pulpit, as in his manner of reasoning by "views." The scholastic way was to take a question, choose a side, and heap up arguments to prove the conclusion. The way of the ponderous sermon-writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was radically the same, except that their proofs were often distorted by fantasy, bloated by impertinent matter, and nearly always overloaded with what, in small quantities, might have been tolerable. The great French preachers (perhaps S. Francis of Sales first set the example of short sermons at his epoch) cut down the huge growths of their predecessors, and made preaching an art. They preserved the method of the "thesis," but they added the graces of artistic imagery, and they showed the world what was meant by "style." They unfortunately succeeded too well. They created what must always be one of the drawbacks of excellent art, they created a "groove" for their successors. A

* Foisset, i. 42; ii. 514.

groove is composed of the accidental and secondary attributes of a great school of art. Every educated reader has an acquaintance with French sermons. Every one knows numbers of them that are undeniably well-written, learned, just, and polished. But there is hardly any one who has not been repelled by a certain uniformity, a kind of regimental "set-up" that seems to strangle the life out of them. It was a great change when Lacordaire dispensed with proposition and proof, and began to develop "views." A view is a truth taken up in a novel light, and carefully placed before the mental eye of the hearer, with all the clearness and brilliancy that can be given by artistic analysis, development, and illustration. In Lacordaire, the "view" by no means shuts out reasoning. On the contrary, there is no word which he uses more frequently than "demonstration." But the reasoning is the hidden thread on which the jewels are strung. Major and minor, antecedent and parallel are no longer like the straight sawn beams that a carpente. brings to build his shed for humanity to shelter in, but fresh boughs with the leaves green and the fruit unplucked that an artist masses into bowers of beauty. An essential of a "view" is novelty. If a view is old or trite, it is not to be called a view, for it cannot impress the sense of the hearer. And Lacordaire was fortunate in novelty, and as bold as he was fortunate. We have already treated of the range of his subjects. Given the Catholic Church and Jesus Christ on the one hand, and the human soul, with its essential needs and also with its especial aspect of them that had been developed in his own era in France; and given, lastly, a man with an eye that could discern,—it was a mere necessary consequence that his discourses should take the shape of a series of reason-pictures, of scenes, of perspectives, of startling *rapprochements*, such as the world had never before been called upon to consider. And as the whole structure is, so are its parts. Let us give one short example of a "view," from the fourth Conference of 1849, that on Prophecy; it is a very subordinate one, but it is an example

Did you ever notice that there are words dead and words living? Words that fall to the ground like a spent arrow, and other words that light upon the spirit like a devouring fire? These words, you did not suppose that the difference between them came from the degree in which the lungs had mechanically stirred the air. No! Their difference comes from the soul, which is the principle of the word. A dead word is a word that issues from a dead soul; a living word is a word that comes from a living soul. When an orator, on a subject capable of eloquence, speaks to you without moving you; when he leaves you with power over your resolutions, insensible to error or to truth—be sure of it, messieurs! it has not been a soul that spoke. For if a soul had spoken, it is not possible that your soul should have remained a stranger to it; it is not possible that one soul should be the object of another's inspiration and not feel the thrill within itself.

It will probably be said that if this is a specimen of Lacordaire, he is fond of exaggeration. In a certain sense every orator must exaggerate. It would be truer to say that every orator must so far fall short of all that can be said on his subject as to bring out unduly the part that he can present. It is also true that, for the sake of immediate effect, the orator will often purposely keep out of sight minor details, and give only salient points. Examples of all this will be found in the Conferences. And it cannot be denied that the desire to make striking points has sometimes led Lacordaire into fancifulness, and that exaggeration is sometimes carried as far as paradox. But, for all that, the man who cannot exaggerate truly, and group the petty and the manifold, without denying them, into the one and the lofty, will never be a great orator. Should any one be ambitious to learn how this may be done, he must arm himself with discretion and study the Conferences of Notre Dame.

One of the great sources of oratorical effect is History. Lacordaire somewhere gives thanks to God that Christianity had lasted for eighteen centuries before his time came to speak of it. His treatment of history is as "phenomenal" as his use of argument. Details are not to his purpose. Grand scenes, striking contrasts, the rise and fall of empires, the changes wrought by the right hand of God—these are what he finds in history. Some of his critics insist that he had never *studied* history, especially the history of the middle ages. This is no doubt true. And it is also true that the history of the middle ages had not been studied by anyone else in that day. But a minute study of history would have been of little use in the pulpit of Notre Dame. He had the great names and the great events of the world to illustrate and enforce his moral with, and he wanted no more. He could allude, as he did so often, to Moses, to Mahomet, to Luther; to Islamism, to Buddhism, to Protestantism. He could call as his witnesses Hebrew prophets, Greek sages, and Roman poets; he could recall names that were at the same time lessons, in Alexander, in Cæsar, in Charlemagne, in S. Louis, and in the name of that hero, for whose misfortunes and Christian death he had a mournful regard that his glory and his success would never have begotten. The grand virtues of the old Romans, the terrors of the barbarians, righteous scourges of God, the young life of new peoples, the despicable decay and vileness of the thing that he hated most in all history, the *Bas Empire*, all in turn came under his hand for the instruction and warning of his own France.

The style of Lacordaire, properly so called,—that is to say, the expressed ideas in detail of which his Conferences are made up,—will at once be recognised to indicate the remarkable possession of that sovereign gift which every genius must have under penalty of

remaining sterile and unable to create—the gift of imagination. As Aristotle long ago remarked, the power of "translating," or of expressing things by images, implies the power of seeing likenesses, and is not only the most important of the means of giving dignity to language, but is the sign of the highest mental ability. It is not too much to say that all the grace and beauty of style is derived from metaphor; not necessarily from long or elaborate similes; but from that continued play of analogy and that unflagging "translation" of abstract notions into beautiful concrete shapes, so well suited to the apprehension of natures made up, like man's, of spirit and matter. The Conferences of Lacordaire are treasures of effective tropes. They contain all kinds. There is the word which at first sight seems a synonym, yet which conveys a slight *nuance* that gives colour to the original conception. There are names so felicitously chosen, carrying with them light and giving life to the inanimate conceits for which they stand. Again, there are the more strongly coloured epithets, sometimes single words, sometimes extending to a phrase, that let in sunshine and fragrance, as when a window is opened on a summer morning. Lastly, there are the formed comparisons, or the completed figures, that stand out from the pages like etchings by a master-hand—rolling paragraphs of sonorous words, in which, as the ear takes in the phrase, the eye sees successive outlines rise and colours deepen, till the orator's ideal is before the very sense, and the sense of the hearer thrills with the experience of beauty, whilst his intellect rejoices in the clearness of the truth.

But the style of Lacordaire is far from being effeminately beautiful, or from presenting the studied grace and cadence of an Isocrates. His power is more conspicuous than his attractiveness. For the sake of power he does not scruple to sacrifice perfect art; and in the determination to be forcible, he cares little for polish of style. What is the secret of his force? The ancient writers on style, after exhausting their rules and devices for metaphor and antithesis, talk of a third quality, which they call "energy." What is the exact analysis of energy? Energy is precisely what most strikes the reader in all that Lacordaire has left. It is not exactly swiftness; yet swiftness and dash of language are a part of it. It is not exactly weight; yet there is a momentum there, and a force of impact, that nothing but weight can give. At one time it seems to be the force of imagery. At another, it is the earnestness that breathes in every phrase. Then it appears to resolve itself into his wonderful gift of suiting the word to the occasion. And then again we think it must be the conversational turn of his language, the lively flow of interrogation, the flash of striking antithesis. The truth seems to be that force in oratory, as in other things, is the result of two factors, the weapon and the arm that

wields it. The orator's weapon is the truth that he utters, considered relatively to the souls that are to receive it. His arm is himself and his personal qualifications, chiefly manifested at the time of speaking. His weapon is the train of ideas that he invents —for every man has to make his own ideas, and by no means finds them ready made; his arm is the soul or conviction that he throws into them. Of Lacordaire's ideas, their sources and their especial character, we have already spoken. His arm, that force of soul that he inspired them with, a force of which he says such great things himself, was chiefly, and so far as it can be distinguished from the expressed ideas themselves, their actual delivery to his audience. In delivery there are two forces: first, the manifestation of the moral character of the speaker; secondly, the impression produced by his physical gifts, such as voice, look, gesture, and the rest. His moral character, with all its devotedness, thoroughness, love of the beautiful and love of souls, shines transparently in the greater part of everything he spoke. To give the reader an idea of his personal presence in the pulpit, we can only endeavour to translate the vivid description given by M. Delpech,* and so conclude.

In the perspective of the pulpit, what struck the spectator most was the orator's commanding appearance. In the distance his delicate features showed only their grander lines, accentuated and severe. The lightning of his look, too piercing under other circumstances, was there subdued and moderated. Under the folds of his mantle, the thin figure seemed to acquire robustness and strength. He seemed taller than nature. At first sight one experienced the surprise and attraction combined that are often felt at the sight of a strange and strong nature. This impression was increased by gesture, voice, elocution, and, generally, by his whole attitude.

His gesture was at once instinct and reflection. Calm at first, slow, self-restrained, impressive, he grew with the subject. Suddenly, the arms opened in a cross, or perhaps described a vast curve. Emotion, deep and heartfelt, had inspired the gesture, and sustained and explained it. His action had a moral value. Soul and body acted in concert. In moments of pathos the hands moved in rapid and uncertain agitation, and seemed to scatter on the hearers the flame of a torch; and the hand seemed then to radiate a light that crossed the lightning of the eye and traced around the head what might have been the aureola of a prophet.

Lacordaire's voice had not those soft and delicate tones that fill a small space with their charm and effect, but are lost in a large one. Clear, incisive, susceptible of force and of passion, his voice grew gradually more fervent—deepened into emotion—rose in power, agitating and carrying on the hearer—and in moments of grief thrilled in vibrations that were as piercing as a sob or a sigh. It was not naturally a pleasing voice, but that was soon forgotten

* Quoted in Foisset, ii. 528.

in the power and truth of the elocution. At first there was some degree of hesitation, but the stream flowed freely as emotion rose, and rushed on faster and faster; then, as the torrent seemed to culminate, it would sometimes suddenly subside and be lost, as though it had disappeared in an abyss. The articulation of the last words was then so agitated and so rapid that they could scarcely be caught. One might have said that the word, hardly able to keep up with the flight of the thought, had let itself be carried away and barely touched the lips in its passage.

Such was his action, partly calculated, partly the effect of sudden inspiration, but always profoundly sincere. His movements were not always unpremeditated and involuntary, but always natural. It was not an affair of learning by heart; it was a soul; and this soul, to use his own expression, would break like a tide through the walls of the flesh, and cast itself, reckless and desperate, into the soul of another.

Art. V. — THE ASSUMPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY, AN APOSTOLICAL TRADITION.

De Corporea Deiparæ Assumptione in Cœlum, an Dogmatico Decreto definiri possit, Disquisitio Historico-Critico-Theologica Domini Aloisii Vaccari *Cassinensis in SS. Patriarchali Basilica S. Pauli de Urbe Parochi.* Romæ, ex Typis Salviucci. 1869.

Theses Dogmaticæ de Ecclesia ejusque Capite et de Homine, necnon Theses Selectæ de Historia Ecclesiastica, quas in Collegio S. Beunonis Prov. Angl. Societatis Jesu propugnandas assumpsit F. Sylvester Joseph Hunter, *ejusdem Societatis,* III. Kal. Aug. A. S. H. MDCCCLXIX.

The Pope and the Council. By Janus. Second Edition. London: Rivingtons. 1870.

In our short comment of January last on the chapter of "Janus" which treated of the Assumption of our Lady in connection with the Vatican Council, we expressed the hope of being able to return to the subject at greater length in April.* The pressing urgency of other matters obliged us to forego carrying out that intention both in April and July. Now, however, that the great question of Pontifical infallibility has been happily settled, we are able to redeem our promise.

---

* Dublin Review, Jan. 1870, p. 246.

Our chief inducement to treat the subject is the desire of joining in the devout wish and hope, which many of the faithful have expressed, that the Holy Council, now sitting, may judge it fitting to crown the edifice of Mary's glories by the dogmatic definition of her Assumption into Heaven. And here, at the very outset, we are met by an objection too important to be passed by without some notice. "When," it is asked, "has a definition of faith been a luxury of devotion?" Has the Church ever precisely declared her faith except when forced to do so by noisy innovators asserting a place within her pale for their soul-destroying heresies? What have we done that we should be forced to carry burdens which our fathers could not bear? In answer to this objection it might be said that not very long ago a dogmatic decree was actually put forth on a point which had never occasioned shipwreck of souls by the sin of heresy, and which at the time of its definition was practically acquiesced in by all, and speculatively doubted by very few. No heresy called for the settlement of the question of the Immaculate Conception; no violent commotion of spirits within the Church demanded an immediate solution. On the contrary, when such a commotion existed, no final step was taken; those who pressed for a decision were put off and even silenced. It was when all discussion, within and without the Church, seemed to be over, that the Holy See took up the question and defined it once and for ever. Or, again, to take an example from the primitive Church, it might be said that the Apostles' Creed was formulated without any external pressure. To this day, what heresy, or sect, or school, has made for itself a place in history by denying the article "I believe in life everlasting"? But suppose there never had been a definition of faith which had not been, so to speak, wrung from the Church against her will—is that, *per se,* any reason why the same line of conduct should always be pursued? Is there anything in the nature of things to keep the Church ignorant of her faith until somebody shall have opened her eyes by denying it? Or, have heretics a prescriptive right to be satisfied, and are the faithful always to remain in ignorance, or doubt, or at best, opinion, as long as they remain faithful? But in real truth the fact is this: when a more precise definition of doctrine comes upon the mind with a jar, as a restriction of liberty, to be borne with indeed, but not loved; as a novelty, hitherto rejected, to be acquiesced in as a *pis aller;* as a something, in short, which enforces a change of mental attitude; then it is easily understood why the multiplication of definitions of faith should be deprecated. But when new definitions are regarded as accessions to our knowledge of divine things,

as firmly-fixed stepping-stones by which we mount to a more extended view of the kingdom of heaven, then are they to be hailed with delight, and received as precious foretastes of the heavenly vision, when we shall see Almighty God as He is, and "know Him even as we are known." "L'appétit vient en mangeant," wrote "Janus" with a sneer. And why not, we may reply, provided the fare be good? Doubtless there is a sense in which the faith of Christ is a yoke to the intellect, just as the law of Christ is a check upon the will. It would be just as reasonable to desire the boundaries between good and evil to be left undefined, as those which separate truth and error. To assert the right and advantage of being allowed to think wrong is no more rational than to assert the right and advantage of being allowed to do wrong. Even if, therefore, a decree on the Assumption were no more than a "luxury of devotion," we should make no apology for expressing a craving for such delicacies. But, of course, it is nothing of the kind, as will be seen in the sequel of this article.

The work, "De Corporea Deiparæ Assumptione," is the most considerable written on the subject in anticipation of the Council. It is full and well-ordered, but the author's critical and logical faculty seems to us hardly on a par with the extent of his reading. The S. Beuno's "Theses" have already been noticed in our pages.* Those on the Assumption are so apposite to our present purpose that we cannot fail to gratify our readers by printing them below *in extenso*.† They express

---

* Dublin Review, Oct., 1869, p. 482.

† De Gloriosa Beatæ Mariæ Virginis in Cœlos Assumptione.

Thesis XCIII. Quum juxta Apostolicam doctrinam, Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 24–26, 54–57; Heb. iv. 14–15, aliisque locis expositam, triplici victoria de peccato, et de peccati fructibus, concupiscentia et morte, quasi ex partibus integrantibus constituatur ille triumphus quem de Satana antiquo serpente, Christus retulit: et quum in Protevangelio Gen. iii. 15, Beata Virgo exhibeatur *singulariter* associata in hoc triumpho Filii sui: non dubitamus quin in eodem oraculo, eadem Beata Virgo præsignificetur eadem triplici victoria insigniter illustris: atque adeo, sicut de peccato per Immaculatam Conceptionem et de concupiscentia per Virginalem Maternitatem, ita et de inimica morte *singularem* triumphum relatura per acceleratam ad similitudinem Filii sui Resurrectionem. Id quod ex speciali unitate carnis, Christum inter Ejusque Matrem, novam accipit illustrationem.

XCIV. De hac Immaculatæ Virginis Resurrectione et in Cœlos Assumptione, antiqua est utriusque Ecclesiæ recepta traditio; in quam servandam, rei manifesta cohærentia cum aliis Beatæ Virginis prærogativis, carentia reliquiarum et sepulchrum corpore Virgineo vacuum conspirabant. Quod si in Ecclesia Occidentali aliquando hæsitatio quædam exstiterit, occasione, ut videtur, Decreti Gelasiani de libris apocryphis, ea tamen non obstante, antiqua sententia talem nacta est a pluribus sæculis consensum, ut a Theologis communiter habeatur pro certa; pro definibili; de qua dubitare Catholico nefas sit; immo non desunt graves auctores qui eam ut jam de fide habeant.

with true scholastic accuracy our own thoughts on the matter, and with greater completeness of outline than we shall be able to develop within the limits of this paper. The question of the Assumption is introduced into Mr. Marriott's book, *à propos* of the mosaic representing the Adoration of the Magi, presented to the Basilica of S. Mary Major by Pope Xystus III., about the year 433, and of the lately discovered fresco of the Assumption in the subterranean Basilica of S. Clement at Rome. This author has considered the subject of so much controversial importance as to depart from the scope of his work (which is an inquiry into the monuments of Christian art bearing on the cultus of the Blessed Virgin and the supremacy of the Pope, followed by a disquisition on the Autun Inscription), by adding an appendix of some length on the literary evidence of the Assumption. Mr. Marriott being an Anglican divine, it will easily be understood that his appreciation of the value of that evidence does not harmonize with ours. And as he is also an Anglican who thinks that Catholics pay divine honour (p. 40) to the mother of God, and offer "idolatrous worship" to a creature, "in derogation of that due to the three persons of the Blessed Trinity" (p. 43), no reader of ours will suspect him of throwing a new light upon any theological subject, or of raising difficulties likely to cause trouble to an adversary. The appendix will be sufficiently refuted in the course of this article, without further reference to this new "no-popery" champion. A competent pen has already given an account of the antiquarian value of the book in the pages of an able weekly contemporary. Besides the "Civiltà Cattolica," several other periodicals in Italy, as Padre Vaccari informs us (p. 259, *sqq.*), have lately had articles advocating the certainty and definability of the doctrine. And, what is no less significant, the venerable Mgr. de Nîmes, in his pastoral letter on the Council, clearly indicates his opinion, not only that the doctrine is definable, but that its truth is so clear as to require no preliminary discussion. And the Archbishop of Smyrna had already petitioned the Holy Father to add this flower to the wreath which he has already placed on the head of the Immaculate Mother of God. So that not only in Italy, but in Asia, in France, and at home,

---

XCV. Exinde constat hoc privilegium, quod in systemate Mariano conspicua pars est, et quod tantopere cum aliis doctrinis revelatis cohæret, Apostolos, ipsumque Joannem, latere non potuisse, ac proinde ex Apostolica traditione Ecclesiæ innotuisse.

XCVI. Sententia igitur de Corporali Assumptione Beatæ Virginis certa est, et proxime definibilis. Quæ ejusdem Deiparæ Virginis gloria ut per solemnem definitionem in proximo Concilio novo splendore augeatur toto corde expetimus.

no insignificant voices have been heard anticipating a definition. We shall scarcely be fairly charged with forwardness, therefore, if, in such company, we also express our sentiments on the subject, not as dictating to the Holy Council, which is no man's province; nor as setting out a "programme" for the Fathers to follow, which is the province of the Sovereign Pontiff only, but simply and solely as "lifting up our testimony," which is always the right, and sometimes the duty, of every faithful Christian.

The scope of the present paper will be to inquire what is the exact object of the festival celebrated throughout the Church under the name of the Assumption, and with what certainty the fact of Our Lady's Corporal Assumption is now held, and so to determine whether that doctrine is capable of being proposed to the faithful as a dogma by the present Council. We shall be able, however, to do little more than touch and comment upon some of the more salient points in the case. Theological readers who may wish for further information will be easily able to consult Canisius, Trombelli, Benedict XIV., or any or all of the numerous writers referred to by Passaglia.* They will also find the results of the labours of these in the work of Padre Vaccari.

In the first place it is desirable to determine the sense of the terms—definable and Assumption. Definability is divided by theologians into *remote* and *proximate*.† A truth is said to be remotely definable if it is really, however implicitly, contained in the Deposit. The same truth becomes proximately definable only in so far as the Church's authentic magisterium accepts and sanctions the scientific development. When the mind of the Church is so clearly expressed as to exclude reasonable doubt of her belief, the truth may be said to be proximately definable *intrinsically;* and when circumstances independent of the truth or falsehood of the doctrine are such that more good than harm, in the judgment of the Ecclesia docens, will result from a dogmatic definition, the truth may be said to be proximately definable *extrinsically*. When a truth is both extrinsically and intrinsically proximately definable, its definition is said to be *opportune*.‡

---

* De Immaculato Deiparæ semper Virginis Conceptu Caroli Passaglia Sac. e Soc. Jesu Commentarius.

† We are referring exclusively to definitions *of faith*.

‡ From the above simple explanations the reader may perceive, *en passant*, how large a part *ignoratio elenchi* occupied in a recent controversy. The opportuneness of defining Papal Infallibility was the question at issue. Very many of the arguments used were directed against the truth of the doctrine.

By the term Assumption, in the present question, we, in the first place, express our belief that the Blessed Virgin Mary has really departed this life, and is no longer on the earth. Secondly, it denotes her entrance into glory as the reward of a virtuous life—in short, her glorification. In this respect the Assumption of Our Lady is the same in kind as the canonization of any other saint. But, thirdly, by the word Assumption, as applied to the Blessed Virgin, is meant that the Mother of God was, by a special favour, exempted from that general law by which the bodies of all the children of Adam, after death, fall into corruption, and are not again united to the souls to which they belong until the general resurrection, which is to take place at the end of the world. Thus the term expresses at once the death, glorification, and anticipated resurrection of the Blessed Virgin. The word is now restricted to denote the triumph of our Blessed Lady. But formerly, and to some extent indiscriminately, it was applied to the departure of any saint; while the terms—*decease, departure, sleep,* &c.—were equally used of the Blessed Virgin.* All these various terms express the same idea, though under two different aspects. Some refer directly to the *terminus a quo,* others directly to the *terminus ad quem.* Nevertheless, the word assumption is peculiarly appropriate as applied to the Blessed Virgin. On the one hand it insinuates the distinction between the glorification of Mary's body effected by a power not her own, and that of Christ's effected by His own power; while, on the other, it denotes that this anticipated resurrection is a privilege peculiar to the Mother of God.

I. Does then the Catholic Church, at the present day, profess belief in the assumption of the Blessed Virgin in the sense just explained? Undoubtedly. It ought not to be necessary to prove the assertion except by general reference to

---

* 1. Agendum deinceps est (says Jean Beleth, a Parisian doctor of the 12th century) de Assumptione Beatæ Mariæ; imprimis tamen scire oportet, quod Sanctorum transitus appellatur multis modis: dicitur enim exodus, transitus, obitus, natale, nativitas, natalitium, dormitio, depositio [he might have added pausatio, somnus, quies, migratio, translatio, metastasis,] quemadmodum et Joannis Evangelistæ passio et assumptio; sed hoc nomen quasi per antonomasiam solummodo de Beata Maria dicitur. Verum beatam Mariam, quod ad animam ejus attinet, assumptam fuisse certo novimus: an vero corpus illius postea etiam assumptum fuerit incertum est, pie tamen credimus ipsam integre fuisse assumptam; sed prius anima, deinde corpore.—*In Explic. Div. Offic.* cap. xii., apud Launoy, *De Controversia super exscribendo Parisiensis Ecclesiæ Martyrologio exorta Judicium.* Ed. 2da. Parisiis, 1671, pp. 26–27.

The learned reader will have observed that, although we are indebted to Launoy for this passage, we have not used it for the same purpose as that learned but unfair controversialist.

the Liturgy and Divine Office. Since one or two contemporary writers, however, have spoken incautiously on the point, it is necessary, before going further, to show that the statement is above exception.* We should be truly setting up a statue of brass with feet of clay, if we were to labour to show that the Church of the past believed in the Assumption, leaving it open to an objector to reply that the notion is not entertained even by the Church of the present. And where shall we look for the mind of the Church if not to the Liturgy, which is the common expression of the common belief; and to the Church's living voice, which is the primary and proximate rule of faith to all? †

First then, in the Roman Missal there is a proper mass for the "Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin." There is no other festival throughout the year with a like title. The Ascension of our Lord is the nearest equivalent, and the similarity of name should not be passed over when we are inquiring what is the object of the festival of the Assumption. More especially is the coincidence striking when taken in connection with the evident parallelism between the feasts of our Lord and of our Lady in the ecclesiastical year. To the Annunciation corresponds the Immaculate Conception; to Christmas the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin; to Good Friday the feast of the Seven Dolours; to the Ascension the Assumption. And if the Ascension of the king is corporal, why not also the Assumption of the queen? No one will suppose this reasoning apodictic, but it will gather strength as we proceed.

Secondly, in the Mass the fact of the Assumption is both

---

* In the Article *Assomption*, in Goschler's *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique de la Théologie Catholique*, translated from the German, G. C. Mayer writes:—"Les formules employées ou autorisées par l'Église ne disent nulle part que la très-sainte Mère de Dieu est unie à son corps." The sentence is literally true, but only because the Church is more careful in her use of language than this writer shows himself to be. The Church does not speak of the mother of God being united to her body, but of her body being united to Her, which comes to the same thing in *facto esse*, but is by no means the same *in fieri*.

† On the authority of the Juge Magisterium, and of the Liturgy as *loci theologici*, see Perrone, Præl. Theol., tom. ii. part ii.; *Tract. de Loc. Theol.*, part ii. sect. ii. cap. ii. 1-4, ed. Romæ, 1842.

And on the Liturgy in particular; hear the strong language of Celestine I. Epist. 21 ad Epp. Galliæ, cap. ii. (Denzinger Enchir., n. 95, ed. 4): *Obsecrationum quoque sacerdotalium sacramenta respiciamus, quæ ab Apostolis tradita in toto mundo atque in omni Ecclesia Catholica uniformiter celebrantur, ut legem credendi statuat lex supplicandi.*

Of course the Pope is speaking of the logical, not of the ontological order.

asserted and repeatedly referred to; and in the Secret Prayer a form of expression is used which is a solecism unless understood as an implied affirmation of the *corporal* Assumption.*

---

* It will not be superfluous to transcribe in order, some passages from the Missal and Breviary. The passage from the *Dictionnaire de la Théologie* on page 399 absolves us from any need of apologizing for the length of our citations on this head. The impatient reader may confine himself to the text. He may also extend this remark to the entire article, on condition of trusting our candour and intelligence.

On the feast of Assumption and throughout the octave, all the clergy who follow the Roman rite read as follows :—

A.—In the Missal.

"Gaudeamus omnes in Domino diem festum celebrantes sub honore beatæ Mariæ Virginis; de cujus *Assumptione* gaudent Angeli et collaudant Filium Dei."—Introit.

"*Assumpta est Maria in cœlum,* gaudet exercitus Angelorum."—Gradual and Offertory; see also the Preface to the same effect.

"Subveniat, Domine, plebi tuæ Dei genetricis oratio: *quam etsi pro conditione carnis migrasse cognoscimus, in cœlesti gloria* apud Te pro nobis intercedere *sentiamus.*"—Secret Prayer. Compare Secret for the Vigil, and the Post-Communion of the feast. *Missale Romanum in Vigilia et Festo Assumptionis B. M. V.*

B. in the Breviary.

"Exaltata est sancta Dei genetrix super choros Angelorum ad cœlestia regna."—Vers. and Resp. in First Vespers, and passim.

"Venite adoremus regem regum cujus hodie ad æthereum Virgo Mater assumpta est cœlum."—Invitatory and passim.

"Quæ est ista quæ ascendit sicut aurora consurgens....."—Antiph. at Benedictus.

In the lessons we read as follows from the second Sermon of S. John of Damascus. Of course we shall quote from the translation in the Breviary. "Hodie sacra et *animata Arca Dei* viventis, quæ suum in utero concepit Creatorem, requiescit in templo Domini, quod nullis est extructa manibus... Hodie Eden Novi Adam *paradisum* suscipit *animatum,* in quo soluta est condemnatio....."—Lesson 4.

"Hodie Virgo Immaculata, quæ nullis terrenis inquinata est affectibus, sed cœlestibus educata cogitationibus, *non in terram reversa est,* sed cum esset *animatum cœlum,* in cœlestibus tabernaculis collocatur. Ex qua enim omnibus vera vita manaret quomodo illa mortem gustaret? Sed cedit legi latæ ab eo quem genuit, et ut filia veteris Adam, veterem sententiam subiit (nam et ejus Filius, qui est vita ipsa, eam non recusavit): ut autem Dei viventis Mater, ad illum ipsum digne *assumitur.*"—Lesson 5.

On the fifth day within the octave, the lessons of the second Nocturn are taken from S. Bernard's first Sermon on the Assumption.

"Virgo hodie *gloriosa cælos ascendens* supernorum gaudia civium copiosis sine dubio cumulavit augmentis."—Lesson 4.

"Sed et illud quis cogitare sufficiat quam gloriosa hodie mundi *Regina processerit,* et quanto devotionis affectu tota in ejus occursum cœlestium legionum prodierit multitudo, quibus ad thronum gloriæ canticis sit deducta quam *placido vultu,* quam *serena facie,* quam divinis *amplexibus* suscepta a Filio, et super omnem exaltata creaturam..."—Lesson 5. The sixth Lesson is to the same effect.

Breviarium Romanum in Festo Assumptionis B. M. Virginis et per Octavam.

The Secret Prayer runs thus:—"O Lord, may the prayer of the Mother of God come to the aid of thy lowly people; for we are sensible that she is interceding for us in the heavenly glory with Thee, although we know full well that she has passed from hence in accordance with the law of flesh." The clause, *etsi pro conditione carnis migrare cognoscimus*, imports nothing less than the integral Assumption of Mary. For, let us suppose that no more is intended than that the soul of the Blessed Virgin is in heaven—the prayer may then be thus paraphrased:—"May Thy Mother's prayers, O Lord, aid Thy people; for we feel that her soul is with Thee in heaven interceding for us; *although* we are aware that, as human nature requires, she has passed through the way of death, and that her body is now in the tomb awaiting the general resurrection. That is, notwithstanding the fact of Our Lady's death, which of itself would seem to imply that she is neither in heaven nor interceding for us, yet we do feel that, by a singular grace, she has overcome that obstacle to her own salvation and her power of interceding for mankind. Taken in connection with the truth, that through the gate of death lies the only road to eternal life, and that the intercession of saints, as such, begins only after death, this reading of the Liturgy is very curious. Let us compare with the above paraphrase the true meaning of the prayer:—"Although, O Lord, we know of a truth that Thy Mother, as being a child of Adam, really passed through the way of death, yet we are not ignorant that she is now, body and soul together, in Thy company in heaven, and is there interceding for her children." On the hypothesis that Our Blessed Lady's soul only is spoken of in the prayer, the sense would require the substitution of *quum, eo quod, quia*, or some other word of a like causal meaning for *etsi*. So the prayer would run:—"Because, O Lord, we know that Thy Holy Mother is truly dead, hence we do not doubt that she is with Thee in heaven, and interceding for us. It may, perhaps, be finally urged that, at all events, the word *sentimus* (we are sensible) implies a doubt, or, at least, is not so strong as *cognoscimus* (we well know). But even this refuge is denied to the objector. Whatever shades of difference there may be in the etymology of the words (and it will hardly be said that, judged by that standard, *cognosco* is stronger then *sentio*), or in established usage, certainly no one conversant with the Roman Missal will suspect any doubt or hesitation to be implied by the word *sentio*. Throughout, the word is there used in the sense of perfect knowledge which has penetrated deep down into the consciousness. We fear that some of our readers may be wearied by this somewhat long verbal disquisition. But when

a book, with the circulation and reputation of the *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique*, roundly asserts that there is not a word in the Church formularies about the corporal Assumption, it becomes a necessity to look carefully into the matter.

Before leaving the Missal we may venture on another remark, suggested by the Gospel read on the feast. Our reading has been too limited to enable us to dwell upon the causes which brought about the selection of the history of Martha and Mary for the Gospel of the Assumption. But it occurred to us, on reading it over, that the connection between it and the object of the festival is closer than is at first sight apparent. Martha and Mary were both friends of Jesus, and devoted to His service. The hearts of both were united to God; yet there was a difference between them: Martha was "busied about many things," while Mary did nothing but sit close to Jesus. Nearness to Jesus was the "one thing necessary." Martha, though united to Him in heart and mind, was yet kept partially away by the cares of the household. Mary had "chosen the better part," which was to be near Jesus, soul and body. And this better part was not to "be taken from her." The parallel is obvious. If any one was ever wholly and entirely united to Jesus, in body and soul, in heart and mind, it was Mary His Mother. The perfect union was never to be dissolved, not even partially and in its less noble part, by the return of her body to the dust from whence it came.

But it is by laying together the Missal and Breviary that we see how undeniably the Church announces her belief of this doctrine. In the Office, passages from Holy Scripture which, in their obvious sense, have reference to the glorification of a body rather than of a spirit, are accommodated, or even applied to the Blessed Virgin.

The Lessons of the first Nocturn on the feast and throughout the Octave are taken from the Canticle of Canticles. If the Church intended to sing the glorification of Our Blessed Lady as to her soul only, the force of the antitheses between the lover and the beloved, the bridegroom and the bride, the brother and sister, the king and queen, would be greatly weakened, if not wholly lost. We are not wholly ignorant that these same expressions are applied to the communion of Jesus with the faithful soul, but neither are we ignorant that such use is by analogy and adaptation from the more literal meaning as applied to the Blessed Virgin. The Lessons of the second Nocturns remove all doubt as to the sense in which such passages are to be understood. In the sermons of S. John of Damascus and S. Bernard, and in those parts of them which are read in the Breviary, the corporal Assumption is categori-

cally asserted and insisted upon by various arguments. Mary is the "living ark of the living God, which has its resting-place in the temple of the Lord." She is the "living paradise" taken up into heaven; in her the old "curse" of death "is broken." "The Immaculate Virgin, stained by no earthly affection, did not return to earth," but, because she was herself a "living heaven, has her place in the tents of heaven." "How could she taste death, from whom flowed life to all? She did however die, because she was a daughter of the old Adam, but she was fitly taken up to the living God because she was His Mother." This is the language of the S. Thomas of the Greeks, taken from his second sermon, read on the feast. And in the Lessons of the second Nocturn for the fourth day within the Octave, the circumstances of Our Lady's death and assumption are related "from an ancient tradition" embodied in the same sermon. The passages recited out of S. Bernard are only less explicit.

Now we are not concerned to maintain the co-ordinate authority of the Office and Liturgy. But the Office is at least a certain and authentic exponent of the Liturgy; necessarily therefore the latter is to be understood in the sense of the former. Thus, from a comparison of the Missal and Breviary, the conclusion, which was already certain, becomes evident. The word "assumption," as used of the Blessed Virgin, in the ecclesiastical language of the present day, always means the anticipated resurrection of the Mother of God, and her exaltation into heaven. Hence, when we are bidden in the mass to rejoice because Mary "has been assumed into heaven," her integral assumption is as surely expressed as if we read *totidem verbis* that her body was risen from the grave, and had been wafted on angels' wings to the realms of eternal bliss. So much for the mind of the Latin Church, as portrayed in her chief liturgical books. We are dispensed from inquiring into the Greek liturgy as well by the fact that no one has been found hardy enough to deny that the doctrine is plainly taught therein, as because the teaching of the Greek liturgical monuments forms the subject of an appendix to the work we have placed first at the head of this article.*

Perhaps there is no more striking proof of the conclusion we are advocating than the fact that in the strange liturgical

---

* This *Appendix*, which is a valuable analysis of authentic documents, ancient and modern, was written, not by the author of the "Disquisitio," but, at his request, by Joseph Cozza-Luzi, a monk of the Basilian monastery at Grotta-Ferrata, near Frascati. The dissertation has been since published in a separate form.

revolution which passed over France about the beginning of last century, the innovators refrained from "improving" the doctrine of the Corporal Assumption off the face of the Liturgy. Notwithstanding the odour of Jansenism which hung about the whole so-called reform, it does not appear that any attack was made upon the pious belief.*

As a complement to the argument drawn from the Liturgy, we may add, what will hardly be denied, that the Feast of the Assumption is now commonly understood by the faithful, educated and uneducated, as the feast of the exaltation of Our Lady's body into heaven. Nor will it be denied that the clergy, to a man, inculcate the pious opinion from the pulpit, and in the catechetical instruction of the people. We may conclude, therefore, this first part of our labour, with the firm conviction that at this moment the Church Universal, pastors and flock, entertains no doubt whatever of the resurrection to glory of the Ever Blessed Mother of God.

But we must not take a step in advance of the point now reached, without noting that, strictly speaking, we have already accomplished the object of this paper. We have shown that the integral Assumption is the object of the festival as now celebrated, and that the festival is universal. The mind of the Church is therefore manifest. Now, on dogmatic principles, no more is needed to authenticate and pronounce upon a tradition, than for the actual living Church of any age to interrogate her own consciousness on the subject. When she finds a belief held by all and everywhere, she knows, without further inquiry, that such belief is no mistake, but a genuine tradition. The preparation for the decree on the Immaculate Conception furnishes a case in point. In writing to the bishops with the view to the immediate promulgation of the dogma, Pius IX. invited them to let him know, among the rest, "what was the piety and devotion of their flocks towards the conception of the Immaculate Deipara:" and, in the Bull "Ineffabilis," among the criteria of a divine tradition is reckoned "the unparalleled agreement" (singularis conspiratio) "of the Catholic bishops

---

* See Foinard, referred to by Guéranger, "Institutions Liturgiques," tome ii., pp. 277–8; and Grancolas, "Commentaire du Bréviaire Romain," tome i.—"Projet d'un Nouveau Bréviaire," p. 347, where the Feast of the Assumption is allowed to rank in the second class, with that of Corpus Christi. See also the "Missale" and "Breviarium Rotomagense," published in 1728, by authority of Archbishop Louis de la Vergne de Tressan, in which not only is the Assumption put in the same class of festivals as Easter and Christmas, but the old Gregorian Collect—"Veneranda"—is retained, which is a prayer far more express than the one now in use in the "Missale Romanum." We shall have occasion to cite it further on.

and faithful." All further investigation is purely scientific, and has no other force and place than to serve as a preparation for a formal definition.* Premising so much as the result of what has been thus far said, we may start at once on our inquiry into the mind of the Church in times past.

II. Since, as Bossuet said, in Suarez we hear the *Schola*, let us take him as witness for the Neo-Scholastics. His date is 1548-1617. He affirms that the exaltation to glory of our Lady's body took place shortly after her death, and that this is the sentiment of the whole Church.† The testimony, as distinct from the reasoning of Suarez, needs no confirmation. When he declares, without limitation, that the Church is unanimous in a certain belief, the reader may rest in as full assurance of the truth of the fact as if he had himself polled Christendom. The belief of the Catholic Church on this point was fully shared in at the same period by the schismatical Greek Churches. The Synod of Jerusalem, in 1672, under the Patriarch Dositheus, cites and makes its own the doctrine contained in Cyril Lucar's Homily on the decease of the Mother of God. Cyril is as explicit and circumstantial as S. John of Damascus. It must be remembered that all the extracts made by the Synod from his writings are taken from his discourses before the clergy and people of Constantinople, and are brought forward for the sole purpose of showing that, in his public capacity, whatever may have been his private leanings towards Protestantism, Cyril conformed to the orthodox Church. His testimony, and therefore that of the Greek Churches of the time, may be summed up in these three propositions. The All-holy Virgin's death arose not from sin, but solely from other causes purely physical. She is the "great sign in heaven," spoken of in the Apocalypse. And she is called a great sign, because she went up into heaven, taking her body with her.‡

---

* Vide *Greg. de Valentia de Fide*, disp. i., q. 1 ; Punct. 7-9-12.

† "Addendum est ultimo, B. Virginem paulo post mortem ad gloriam et immortalem vitam *corporis* et animæ resurrexisse, atque in cœlum gloriosam ascendisse. *Ita sentit universa Ecclesia.*"—Suarez, *de Myst. Vitæ Christi*, disp. xxi., sect. 2, n. 4.

‡ The Synod made no less than six extracts from Cyril's Homily *εἰς τὴν κοίμησιν τῆς θεοτόκου*. We are reluctantly obliged to content ourselves with quoting one or two sentences. In the first extract we read—"Ποῖα εἶναι τούτη ὁποῦ ἀναβαίνει ἀπὸ τὸν ὁράτον κόσμον." κ. τ. λ. In the fourth—"Ἡ παναγία παρθένος ὁποῦ ἐκοιμήθη, ἡ αἰτία τῆς κοιμησεώστης, δὲν ἦτον ἐξ ἁμαρτίας, μόνον ἀπὸ ταῖς ἄλλαις αἰτίαις ταῖς φυσικαῖς." κ. τ. λ. In the fifth—"Τὶ πρᾶγμα εἶναι ἐκεῖνο ὁποῦ να φαίνεται διὰ μεγάλον σημεῖον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, . . . ἄλλον δὲν εἶναι παρὰ ἡ παναγία , . . . λέγεται σημεῖον ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ διατὶ μὲ τὸ σῶμα ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν." (*Coleti Conc. Coll.*, tom. xxi., pp. 674-5.) Notwithstanding Cyril's (to our

From the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries we may take a stride backward to the thirteenth, and certainly if Suarez is entitled to be heard as spokesman for his age, no less a place can be given to S. Thomas Aquinas, *theologorum facile princeps* (1227-1274). His testimony to the corporal Assumption is as precise as that of Suarez, and is repeated in at least four different parts of his writings. "It is our *belief* (he says) that after death [the Blessed Virgin] was raised to life again and carried into heaven, according to the Psalm,—Arise, O Lord, into Thy rest, Thou and the Ark which Thou hast made holy." *

When we pass the era of the scholastics into the earlier middle age, the faith of Christendom in the doctrine of the Assumption is declared by the universality and solemnity of the festival. S. Nicholas I. (858) testifies that, in his time, the Roman Church had received from antiquity the custom of keeping the Assumption with fast and vigil; a custom which shows that feast to have been on a par with Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost.† S. Leo IV. (847) added the Octave, which had not been kept before his time at Rome,‡ as we learn from Anastasius, the Librarian. The festival is ordered to be kept as a feast of the first rank by provincial or national Councils in the Frankish Empire (813); in England (747); in the parts

---

ideas) eccentric Greek, his meaning is sufficiently clear. Trombelli somehow fell into the unaccountable error of confounding the Cyril Lucar, here spoken of, with S. Cyril of Alexandria, who flourished in the first half of the fifth century. Padre Vaccari (pp. 110, 111), after quoting from Trombelli, makes a remark about doubtful authenticity, which shows indeed that he was alive to the incongruity of such language as we have quoted in the mouth of Cyril of Alexandria, but shows also that it does not seem to have occurred to him to read the acts of the Council.

* We must be content with one extract. "Tertia (maledictio) fuit communis viris et mulieribus, ut scilicet in pulverem reverterentur: et ab hac immunis fuit beata Virgo, quia cum corpore est assumpta in cœlum. *Credimus* enim quod post mortem resuscitata fuerit et portata in cœlum.—Ps. cxxxi. Surge Domine in requiem tuam, tu et arca sanctificationis tuæ."—*D. Thom. Opusc. IV. Exposit. Salut. Angel.* Cf. *Opusc. V. Exposit. Symb. et Sum. Theol. III.* q. 27, a. 1, in corp. et *III.* q. 83, a. 5 ad 8.

† "Quoniam licet omnibus orare et abstinere conveniat, jejuniorum tamen temporibus amplius abstinentiæ inservire oportet, videlicet ut qui se sciverit illicita perpetrasse, secundum sacra decretalia in his etiam a licitis se quibusdam abstineat, quadragesimali videlicet tempore, quod est ante Pascha, jejunio post Pentecosten, *jejunio ante solemnitatem Assumptionis S. Dei Genetricis et semper Virginis Dominæ Nostræ Mariæ*, necnon jejunio ante Natalis Domini Nostri Jesu Christi festivitatem: *quæ jejunia Sancta Romana suscepit antiquitus et tenet Ecclesia.*" (*Coleti Conc. Coll.*, tom. ix., p. 1536.) Some of the Orientals kept fast not only on the vigil, but seem to have extended it over the preceding fortnight.—Cf. *Baillet*, ad diem 15 Aug.

‡ "Octavum Assumptionis B. Genetricis diem, quæ minime Romæ antea colebatur . . . . celebrari præcepit" [Leo].—*Anast. Bibl. ot. in Leonem IV.*

of Germany evangelized by S. Boniface (circ. 745). The Synod of Maintz, in 813, was celebrated by command of Charlemagne, and had for its object to bring about uniformity of discipline with Rome. The thirty-sixth Canon regulates the solemn festivals to be celebrated throughout the year. The number is very select, being but fifteen in all. The Assumption is among them, and occupies the place which it now holds in the Calendar.* The object of the second Council of Cloveshoe (747) was the same as that of Maintz, and the thirteenth Canon orders that the calendar of the Roman Church be used throughout England.† So also in the Statutes of S. Boniface, for the regulation of his German churches, the Assumption appears as a holyday of obligation.‡ These authorities carry us back to the period when Charlemagne (742-814) was still an infant. And we know from their own testimony, that England, France, and Germany derived the feast from the Roman Church, in which the solemnity was already ancient in the time of Pope S. Sergius I. (687), who decreed that "on the Annunciation, the Nativity of Our Lord, and the *Repose* of the ever Virgin Mary, the Litany should start from S. Hadrian's, and be met by the faithful at S. Mary's."§ It is plain from the language of Anastasius that the feast of the *Dormitio* or Assumption was no new thing at that period, but a solemnity of the first order. It is also worth while to observe that the same author employs the terms *dormitio* and *assumptio* indiscriminately.|| Nor is the thread of positive evidence lost at this point. We learn from Nicephorus Callixtus, that the Emperor Maurice (582-602) ordered the repose (κοίμησις) of the Deipara to be celebrated on the 15th of August. And Maurice did not institute the festival, but merely had it trans-

---

* After decreeing that Easter, the Ascension, and Pentecost are to be solemnly celebrated, the Canon goes on:—"In Natali Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, diem unum [observari decrevimus], Nativitatem S. Joannis Baptistæ, *Assumptionem S. Mariæ*, Dedicationem S. Michaelis, Natalem S. Remigii, S. Martini, S. Andreæ."—*Coleti Conc. Coll.*, tom. ix., p. 337.

† "Tertio decimo definitur decreto, ut uno eodemque modo dominicæ dispensationis in carne sacrosanctæ festivitates, ... celebrentur, *juxta exemplar videlicet quod scriptum de Romana habemus Ecclesia.* Itemque ut per gyrum totius anni natalitia Sanctorum, uno eodem die, *juxta martyrologium ejusdem Romanæ Ecclesiæ* . . . . venerentur.—*Ibid.*, tom. viii., p. 324.

‡ In Statute 36 we read:—"Adnuncient Presbyteri diebus Dominicis per annum sabbatizandum. Primo modo . . . . *in Assumptione sanctæ Mariæ* XVIII. Kal. Sept. diem unum."—*Ibid.*, tom. viii., p. 312.

§ (Decrevit Sergius) "ut diebus Annunciationis, Domini Nativitatis, et *Dormitionis S. Dei Genetricis, semperque Virginis Mariæ* . . . . Litania exeat a S. Hadriano et ad S. Mariam populus occurrat."—*Anast. Biblioth. in Sergium Papam.*

|| See above, note on S. Leo IV.

ferred from January to August.* Here then is a continuous chain of evidence, from various quarters, running up into the sixth century, not stopping there, but ever pointing to a past which baffles investigation. The feast of the Assumption is as solemnly kept when we first meet it in history as it is at this day, and wears the same aspect of immemorial antiquity.†

As the existence and rank of the festival are demonstrated by the testimonies hitherto produced, so its object is still more clearly shown by the Martyrologies, Menologies, Calendars, and Sacramentaries, in which we see the provisions of the Popes and Councils carried into execution.‡ The most considerable Martyrologies and Calendars, except that of Ado (859?) and Usuard (876), of which more hereafter, describe this festival by the term Assumption; and some use expressions which can only be understood of corporal assumption. In the Menology of the Emperor Basil we read that when it pleased God to take (*ἀναλαμβάνειν*) His Blessed Mother to Himself, He warned her of her removal (*μετάστασις*) through an Angel.

But we must hasten on to the Sacramentaries, which are at once the most authentic and the most explicit witnesses to Mary's privilege. The Mozarabic Missal, the Gallican, Gothic, and Gregorian, perhaps also the Gelasian and even the Leonine, Sacramentaries proclaim in various forms of speech, but in one and the same sense, the triumph of the Virgin Mother over death and corruption. In them all her passage is spoken of as a hidden thing, without parallel among men. She died indeed, but only for a time. Her virginal flesh was superior to the dissolution of the tomb. The bands of death were unable to hold in their embrace the immaculate flesh of her who was at once a Virgin and a Mother, nor any rock shut in that Mother whose child-bearing had been

---

* The passage of Nicephorus is taken from lib. xvii. cap. 28. We borrow it from Benedict XIV. "Idem Imperator [Justinianus] tum primum Servatoris exceptionem toto orbe terrarum festo die honorari *instituit*, sicut Justinus de Sancta Christi Nativitate fecit; atque non ita longo post tempore, *Mauritius Sacrosanctæ Dei Genetricis Dormitionem quindecimo Augusti mensis die celebrari præcepit.*" (Nicephorus, apud Benedictum XIV. *de Festis D. N. J. C. et B. M. V. de Festo Assumpt.*) The reader will have observed the distinction between the expressions *instituit* and *celebrari præcepit*, as also the mention of the day of the month in the second case. We believe that most, if not all, critics who receive the doctrine of the Assumption are agreed in seeing in these different turns of expression indications that the feast of the Assumption does not date its institution, but only its translation, from the Emperor Maurice.

† On this part of the subject students will do well to consult Sollier on Usuard in the Bollandists, *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. vii., *Junii*.

‡ This Menology was published at Urbino in 1727 by order of Benedict XIII. The learned are divided on the question whether it is to be ascribed to Basil the Macedonian (867), or to Basil the Younger (977).

painless.* This is the teaching of the Liturgical monuments of the whole Western Church. The documents themselves reach back to the sixth century, and very probably to the fifth. Their similarity refers them to a common origin, which was no other than the common faith of all; their completeness shows that when they were written that faith was no novelty. In the notes we quote at some length from the Gothic and Gallican Sacramentaries; room must be found in the text itself for the celebrated prayer *Veneranda*, from the Gregorian Sacramentary. The Mass for the festival is inscribed in some MSS., *Assumptio S. Mariæ*, in others, *Pausatio S. Mariæ*. In some the prayer *Veneranda* is read on the vigil, and *Famulorum* (the modern prayer) on the feast. Padre Vaccari cites Cod. Reg. Suec. Vatic., n. 337, in which the prayer runs thus:† "May this day's worshipful festival, O Lord, bear to us saving aid. On this day the holy Mother of God underwent a temporary death, yet could she not be kept down by the bands of death, because she bore Thy Son, our Lord, made flesh from her." Here we have asserted, in express terms, the resurrection of our Lady before her body had had time to suffer dissolution, and the reason of that privilege, viz., the intimate union of her flesh with that of the Son of God. The secret prayer is the same as we have transcribed above from the modern Missal, and in which, we have seen, the same doctrine is taught. Muratori, indeed, considered the *Veneranda* a later addition to the Sacramentary. We should have been greatly

---

* In the *Sacramentarium Gallicanum*, edited by Mabillon, which agrees with the Gothic, and is ascribed by that antiquarian to the beginning of the seventh century, in the *Oratio* of the "Mass on the Assumption" we read as follows:—"Generosæ diei Dominicæ Genetricis inexplicabile sacramentum, tanto magis præconabile sacramentum, quantum inter homines *adsumptione Virginis singulare*, apud quam vitâ integritas obtinuit filium, et mors *non invenit par exemplum; nec minus ingerens stuporem de transitu*, quam exultationem ferens unico beata de partu . . . . beata Maria de partu clara, de merito felix prædicatur post transitum." And in the *Contestatio*—"Vere dignum . . . . virgo Dei genetrix Maria de mundo migravit ad Christum [the Gothic adds—*quæ nec de corruptione suscepit contagium, nec resolutionem pertulit in sepulchro: pollutione libera*], germine gloriosa, adsumptione secura, paradisi dote prælata, damna de coitu [the Gothic has the true reading—nesciens damna de coitu] . . . non subdita labori per partum, non dolori per transitum . . . . Recte ab ipso *suscepta* es in Adsumptione feliciter, quem pie suscepisti conceptura per fidem; ut *quæ terræ non eras conscia, te non teneret rupis inclusa*. Vere diversis infulis anima redimita, cui . . . . reddunt . . . . Christus amplexum, nubis veicolum, adsumptio paradisum."—*Mabillon, Mus. Ital.*, pp. 300, 301, edit. Paris, 1667.

† Veneranda nobis, Domine, hujus diei festivitas opem conferat salutarem. In qua Sancta Dei Genetrix mortem subiit temporalem, *nec tamen mortis nexibus deprimi potuit, quia* Filium tuum Dominum nostrum *de se* genuit *incarnatum*.

surprised that the learned critic had so easily yielded up the prescriptive reading, in deference to Grimaldus, had we not known that he was author of a treatise against the Immaculate Conception. Moreover, as we have already seen, the doctrine is also expressed in the Secret, about the age of which there is no controversy. Launoy further maintains that, even granting the authenticity of the prayer, it contains no argument for the Assumption. He contends that the phrase, *mortis nexibus*, is to be understood of the death of sin, not of natural death. The interpretation is wild and desperate, and simply indefensible, whether on grounds of grammar, of logic, or of doctrine. Grammatically the same word—*mors*—cannot bear two different senses in the same construction and the same sentence, without notice of the change. Logically and doctrinally it is absurd to say that the Divine Maternity was the cause of Our Lady's preservation from mortal sin. Lastly it is evident, from simple inspection, that the Maternity is looked at in the prayer *Veneranda*, solely in its physical aspect, and not at all from a moral point of view. The penalty, from which the Blessed Virgin was free, is physical; the cause assigned for her preservation belongs to the same order.

Again then, we are by another route arrived at the sixth century, and again meet with the same phenomenon as before. As the festival, so its real object, is plainly visible, always and everywhere as we look back through the ages, until once more at the same point, we seem to see it fade away from our sight and almost disappear, yet leave an undefinable consciousness of its presence, as also an impression of remoteness, which are genuine characteristics of an Apostolical tradition at a certain stage of development.

The testimony of the Ecclesiastical Offices is reflected and expanded in the private writings of the time. The most copious and, after the public documents, the most authoritative instruments of tradition from the sixth to the twelfth century, are the Homilies or Sermons preached to the faithful on Sundays and festivals. Our limits forbid us to construct a catena of these testimonies. It would also be an unnecessary labour, for this part of our task has been often and fully performed. But we must not omit so much as is necessary to show the recurrence of the phenomenon which has already twice claimed our attention. Just as we lost sight of the festival in the decrees of Popes and Councils, at the sixth century, and of the doctrine which the festival commemorated, in the Sacramentaries at the same period, so in the ecclesiastical writers, Western as well as Eastern, the doctrine shines out, affirmed by most, doubted by a few, denied by none, up to the same

epoch, when it sinks, as it were, almost out of view, yet leaves tokens of its presence, which are uncertain only while detached from it and from each other. We have already heard S. Bernard (1153) and S. John of Damascus (circ. 730). They are not more explicit than Peter of Blois (1200), than Glycas, than Hildebert of Tours (1134), Anselm of Canterbury (1109), in the twelfth century; than Peter Damiani (1072), Fulbert of Chartres (1028), in the eleventh; Hincmar of Rheims (circ. 882), Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople (828), Theodore Studita (836), in the ninth; Germanus of Constantinople (733), Andrew of Crete (circ. 730), in the eighth; Ildephonsus of Toledo (667), Modestus of Jerusalem (632), in the seventh; Venantius Fortunatus (circ. 600), Gregory of Tours (595), in the sixth. One or two testimonies from different periods cannot be omitted.

With the eyes of the mind (writes S. Peter Damiani) look upon the Son as he ascends, and on the Mother as she is assumed, and you shall see a something surpassing exhibited in the Ascension of the Son, and a something glorious shown forth in the Assumption of the Virgin. For the Saviour went up into heaven by authority of His powerful might, as Lord and Creator, accompanied by the service of angels, not supported by their aid: Mary *was taken up into heaven*, but by a decree of grace which raised her up, with the accompaniment and aid of angels. For grace, not nature, supported her beneath. Hence this day is named the Assumption, that the Ascension; since power is different from mercy, and it is the Creator's privilege alone to overpass the nature of things by His Own power.*

On this beautiful passage we would only observe that the Saint is not to be understood as implying that the Blessed Virgin needed the angels' support at her Assumption. Her body, as being glorious, had of course the gift of agility. The angels' ministry symbolized the distinction between the Ascension and the Assumption. Christ ascended into heaven by His own inherent power, His Mother was raised up by a special grace of God. Theodore Studita shall speak for the ninth century and for the Greeks. In his sixth discourse on

* Intuere mentalibus oculis Filium ascendentem, et matrem assumptam, et videbis aliquid excellentius in ascensione Filii exhiberi, et aliquid gloriosius in assumptione Virginis demonstrari. Ascendit enim Salvator in cœlum *potestativæ virtutis imperio*, sicut Dominus et Creator, angelorum comitatus obsequio, non auxilio fultus: assumpta est Maria in cœlum, sed gratiæ sublevantis judicio, comitantibus et auxiliantibus angelis, quam sublevabat *gratia non natura*. Ideo dies hæc Assumptio, illa Ascensio vocatur; cum aliud sit *potentia*, aliud *misericordia*, solumque sit soli privilegium Creatori, naturam rerum *propria potestate* supergredi.—*S. Pet. Dam. Serm. de Assumpt. Virg.*

the Κοίμησις, after describing the Blessed Virgin as the true Mount Sion, in which it pleased God to dwell, he continues: "To-day then the earthly heaven, wrapped round with the robe of incorruption, is removed to an abode which is happier and lasting."* The testimony of Ildephonsus is too important to be passed over. After descanting at length upon the glories of Mary and the greatness of the festival of her Assumption, he goes on:—

> And certainly we must not omit what many with pious zeal piously embrace, namely, that she [Mary] was on this day raised up in the body to the heavenly palace by her Son the Lord Jesus Christ. Although it is pious so to believe, yet should it not be rashly affirmed by us, lest we should seem to receive doubtful things as certain. For whether this be true or no, it behoves us nevertheless to believe that she is reigning with her Son in heaven, and, after God, is confirming us in all truth, and guarding us by her merits and prayers.†

We have quoted this passage because it is at once evidence of the "pious belief," and the first expression, as far as we can ascertain, of doubt by a known author. Vaccari thinks that by the word doubtful, Ildephonsus means undefined or, as we should say, free. Whatever may be thought of the Padre's interpretation, which has the merit of showing a proper reverence for the holy Fathers, as well as of being ingenious, it is plain that the Primate of Spain could not have been ignorant that the corporal Assumption was taught in the Gregorian Sacramentary, as in the prayer *Veneranda,* so also in the Secret. The truth is, as we shall see presently, Ildephonsus's doubt arose from the Gelasian decree *de Libris Apocryphis.* It was not shared by a more ancient Father, Gregory of Tours, whose witness shall close the list. He is as clear and definite as if he were writing in the nineteenth century instead of in the sixth. "And lo! again the Lord stood by, and ordered the holy body to be taken up and carried to paradise; where, now united to the soul, and rejoicing in company with the

---

* Σήμερον τοιγαροῦν ὁ ἐπίγαιος οὐρανὸς τῷ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας περιβολαίῳ ἑλισσόμενος, ἐξαλλάττεται εἰς διαμονὴν τὴν βελτίονά τε καὶ μακραιῶνα.—*Orat. VI. in Deip. Dorm. Mai, Nov. Biblioth. PP.*, tom. v. part 3 (*apud Passaglia de Immac. Conc.*, p. 982).

† Nec sane illud omittere debemus quod *multi pietatis studio pientissime complectuntur*, eam [Mariam] hodierna die a Filio suo Domino Jesu Christo ad cœli *corporaliter* sublevatam palatium. Quod licet pium sit credere, a nobis temere non debet affirmari, ne videamur *dubia* pro certo recipere. Verum enim hoc sit, necne, nos tamen convenit credere cum Filio suo in cœlestibus eam regnare; nosque post Deum in omni veritate confirmare, meritis et precibus præmunire.—*S. Ildeph. Tolet. in Assumpt. Virg. Serm. VI.*

elect, it enjoys the good things of eternity, which shall never come to an end."* Once more then we have reached the sixth century, and again we find ourselves in presence of the doctrine, as complete, as sharply defined, as widespread as at this moment.

But here we shall be stopped by a difficulty which cannot be passed over in silence. How, it will be asked, is this conclusion reconcilable with S. Ildephonsus's doubt, which was shared by several others; how with Charlemagne's decision to leave the matter open for further inquiry; how with the treatise of Pseudo-Jerome; above all, how with the martyrology of Ado and Usuard, which not only expresses doubts, but implies that the idea of the corporal Assumption is frivolous and apocryphal? The passage of S. Ildephonsus we have already seen. In the Capitulary, Charlemagne, after enumerating all the feasts of the year, reserves the Assumption for further inquiry.† Pseudo-Jerome, in the ninth letter to Paula and Eustochium, writes: —

About the Assumption . . . . I have taken care to write to you . . . . lest perhaps, if that apocryphal work on the passage of the Blessed Virgin should come into your hands, you should take things doubtful for certain. For many of the Latins, through love of piety, read and receive it too eagerly; especially since nothing of these things can be discovered for certain, except that on this day [the Blessed Virgin] gloriously left her body. . . . . Many of ours doubt whether she was assumed together with her body, or whether she departed leaving her body behind. But how, or at what time, or by what persons her most holy body was thence taken, or where it was placed, or whether she arose again, is unknown; although some wish to establish that she has been already raised to life again, and is clothed with a blessed immortality in the company of Christ in heaven. And very many affirm the same of Blessed John the Evangelist. . . . . We are, however, in doubt which of these things is considered the more true.‡

---

* Et ecce iterum adstitit ei Dominus, conceptumque corpus sanctum deferri jussit in paradisum; ubi nunc, assumpta anima, cum electis ejus exultans æternitatis bonis nullo occasuris fine perfruitur. (*Greg. Turon. de Glor. Conf. et Mart.*, lib. i. cap. 4.) We have taken *assumpta anima* as an ablative absolute, and *assumpta* as equivalent to resumpta. If we are wrong, the mistake concerns our scholarship, but does not affect the argument.

† Hæ sunt festivitates in anno, quæ per omnia servari debent. . . . De Assumptione Sanctæ Mariæ interrogandum relinquimus.—*Capit.*, lib. i. cap. 164.

‡ De Assumptione. . . . . scribere vobis curavi . . . . ne forte si venerit in manus vestras illud apocryphum, de Transitu ejusdem Virginis, dubia pro certis recipiatis: quod multi Latinorum pietatis amore, studio legendi charius amplectuntur: præsertim cum ea his nihil aliud experiri possit pro certo, nisi quod hodierno die gloriosa migravit a corpore. . . . . Multi nostrorum dubitant assumpta fuerit simul cum corpore, an abierit relicto corpore. Quomodo autem, vel quo tempore, aut a quibus personis sanc-

In the same place there is much more to the same effect.

Usuard has still stronger expressions of doubt. On August 15th he commemorates the "repose of Holy Mary Mother of God. Although her most sacred body is not found on earth, yet holy mother Church so celebrates her venerable memory that she doubts not of her departure, following the law of flesh. But where that venerable temple of the Holy Spirit has been hidden by the divine will and counsel, the sobriety of the Church has elected to be piously ignorant of, rather than on that ground to hold and teach anything frivolous and apocryphal."

Now, on these passages, and all others like them, as, for instance, the well-known passage in "Adamnanus de Locis Sanctis," we make the following general observations:—(1) In none is the corporal Assumption denied. (2) All are evidently from the same fount. The identity of language, as of thought, in Usuard, Pseudo-Jerome, Adamnanus, and Ildephonsus, shows that these writers drew from the same source. (3) That source can have been no other than some treatise written against Pseudo-Melito. If the epistle to Paula and Eustochium was written in the sixth century, it is probably from it we are to date the origin of the doubt. Probably enough the writer took S. Jerome's name on account of that Father's influence on the decrees of Hormisdas and Gelasius *de Libris recipiendis et non recipiendis.* But if the letter is of a later date, we must, for the present at all events, remain in ignorance of the first author of the doubt. (4) The attack on Pseudo-Melito arose from the fact that the book, "de Transitu Mariæ," had been placed on the list of apocryphal writings by Pope Gelasius (494). (5) It is beyond question that no doubt of the fact of the Assumption was implied by the act of Gelasius. We have shown, *ad abundantiam,* that within a century of the period of the Gelasian decree the doctrine of the corporal Assumption was already professed openly and everywhere, and

---

tissimum corpus ejus inde ablatum fuerit, vel ubi transpositum: utrumne resurrexerit, nescitur: quamvis nonnulli astruere velint eam jam resuscitatam, et beata cum Christo immortalitate in cœlestibus vestiri. Quod et de Beato Joanne Evangelistæ . . . . plurimi asseverant . . . . Verumtamen quid horum verius censeatur, ambigimus.—*Inter. Opp. Hier.*, tom. xi. pp. 123-4, ed. Migne.

* Dormitio Sanctæ Mariæ Genetricis Dei. Cujus sacratissimum corpus etsi non invenitur super terram, tamen pia mater Ecclesia ejus venerabilem memoriam sic festivam agit, ut pro conditione carnis eam migrasse non dubitet. Quo autem illud venerabile Spiritus Sancti templum nutu et consilio divino occultatum sit, plus elegit sobrietas Ecclesiæ cum pietate nescire, quam aliquid frivolum et apocryphum inde tenendo docere.—*Martyrol. Usuardi,* ad diem xviii. Kal. Sept.

especially by the Church of Rome itself. And no one will maintain that S. Gregory I. did not know the tradition of his own Church. Moreover, the Gelasian Index (so to call it) has a very various significance according to the intrinsic quality of the books contained therein. Some are condemned as heretical. In others it is the claim of inspiration which is declared to be groundless. Pseudo-Melito's book is just one of these, and was further subject to condemnation, as containing a large superstructure of apocryphal circumstances over the substantial foundation of truth. (6) It is highly probable that Pseudo-Jerome and Usuard hesitated about the Assumption, because they thought that doctrine hard to be reconciled with the real death of the Blessed Virgin. (7) And, lastly, the nature and history of this doubt are such that it can by no means be taken as expressing the true mind of the Church. It is negative in its nature; it arose by accident; it never spread widely; it was formally erased from the Office of the Church of Paris, its chief stronghold; it finally died out altogether.

We may add a word or two of the particular heads of objection. In the passage from the Capitulary we cannot admit any difficulty. Charles merely says that inquiry must be made before determining whether the Assumption is to be placed among the feasts of the first class, to be kept throughout the Empire. At all events, whatever be the sense and force of the Emperor's question, the Synod of Maintz has already furnished the answer. Pseudo-Jerome is worthless as a witness on either side. He evidently knows nothing about the matter, and writes incoherently. Sometimes he speaks as if the question were about the real death of the Blessed Virgin; at others as if the accidental circumstances of the death and Assumption were the question at issue; and finally, after grudgingly admitting that some (nonnulli) strive to establish the resurrection of Mary, he continues that a very large number (plurimi) contend stoutly for the same privilege in favour of S. John the Evangelist. The numbers should be exactly reversed.

But in truth, even if this hesitation had been of proportions far more vast than it ever reached, it could never furnish a difficulty against the doctrine. It found the tradition in possession; it nowhere and never displaced it; it is dead and buried, and the tradition remains. Whatever difficulties such a doubt may throw in the way of the critic or historian, it can offer none to the dogmatic theologian. Indeed, paradoxical as it may sound, this passing doubt had its place in the development of the doctrine of the Assumption. For, as we shall see more clearly presently, the positive tradition of our Lady's

integral Assumption began contemporaneously with that of her death. The explanation of the coincidence is simple. The anticipated resurrection of Mary had been *implicitly* believed from the first, and when the question came *explicitly* to the surface, the opinions of those who reasoned and wrote divided themselves, as usual, into three classes. First there were those who had a firm grasp of the truth of the Assumption, and denied or doubted the Blessed Virgin's death, which they thought inconsistent with the translation of her body. Secondly, there were those who held firmly the no less important truth of Mary's real death, and doubted her Assumption for the same reason as the others doubted her death. The former were penetrated with the truths that death is a penalty of sin, and that sin had no part in Mary. The latter were no less alive to the necessity of guarding the reality of Christ's and Mary's flesh against the Docetæ and their offshoots. Each party held an integral portion of the truth, and erred only in so far as it entered on the path of negation. Lastly, there were those who kept hold of both sides of the truth, notwithstanding the apparent inconsistency, and who thus had the good fortune to become the interpreters of the sense of the Church in their own day, and to us a channel of the genuine tradition.

We have now made good a second step in this inquiry. We saw above that the Catholic Church of the nineteenth century, without a shadow of doubt, teaches in express words the corporal Assumption of the Mother of God. We know now that the doctrine was quite as explicitly professed in the sixth century, and probably in the fifth. There has not been the smallest development from that time. For the sake of simplifying the argument, and saving space by the omission of all disputable or doubtful proofs, we shall admit (without granting) that the proposition—Mary's body is now united to her soul in heaven by an anticipated resurrection—is not to be found, *totidem verbis,* in any known document universally recognized as genuine, and proved to have been certainly written before the sixth century. But in return for this large concession, we claim to have established the following points:—(1) The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary has been and is a feast of the Church Universal. (2) The object of the feast has never been merely to commemorate the happy death of the Mother of God. If this all-important point needed further proof, it would be sufficient to recollect that several churches, *e.g.,* the Coptic, commemorated our Lady's death (κοίμησις) in January, and her Assumption (ἀνάληψις) in August. (3) Nor again has its object ever been merely to proclaim the

Church's belief that Mary's soul is in the enjoyment of the Beatific Vision. Such an interpretation is unequal to the language of some of the most ancient and authoritative documents. (4) But its object has always been to commemorate both those events, together with this other special privilege of the Mother of God, namely, that her body has been saved from the corruption of the grave by its resurrection to glory shortly after its separation from the soul. Whoever has followed this article up to the present point must see that the Catholic Church, from the time specified, has held up to the veneration of her children the Assumption in its integrity.

And we claim to have established also that the tradition has been not only constant and universal, but mature, developed, and complete, through every part of its course. The position which it held in the schools may be gathered from the censures passed by the Theological Faculty of Paris in the year 1497 on certain propositions which had been defended by two doctors under its jurisdiction. The proposition—"that Christ met the Virgin Mary in her Assumption is apocryphal"—was condemned as "false, contrary to the Fathers, favouring irreverence, offensive to pious ears, calculated to turn the people from the devotion it has towards the Virgin Mother of God;" and had therefore to be "retracted." And the proposition —"We are not bound to believe, under pain of mortal sin, that the Virgin was assumed in body and soul, because it is not an article of faith"—was censured as "rash, scandalous, impious, calculated to lessen the people's devotion towards the Virgin, *false and heretical;* and had accordingly "to be retracted publicly." * Now are we to suppose that the idea of the Assumption, so extraordinary, so profoundly connected with truths which, in the sixth century, were yet in an early stage of development, sprang forth, like Athene from the head of Zeus, full-grown from the brain of some obscure forger; spread instantaneously through the length and breadth of the Catholic world; met not one opponent in its progress, and but

---

* "Tertia propositio: Christum occurrisse virgini Mariæ in sua Assumptione apocryphum est. Falsa est, contra scripta Doctorum, impietati favens, piarum aurium offensiva, detractiva populi a devotione, quam habet ad Virginem Dei Genetricem; ideo revocanda.

"Quarta Propositio: Nos non tenemur credere sub pœna peccati mortalis, quod Virgo fuit assumpta in corpore et anima, quia non est articulus fidei. Ut jacet, temeraria, scandalosa, impia, devotionis populi ad Virginem diminutiva, *falsa et hæretica;* ideo revocanda publice."—*Apud Launoy*, l. c., p. 110. If any one wishes to see an irrepressible disputant bent on saying something where there is nothing to be said, he cannot do better than read the objections Launoy makes to the authority of this *Censura.*

few sceptics; was received from the first by all schools of theology; has been qualified as certain, not to be denied without rashness, proximate to faith by theologians generally; nay, as *de fide* by the first university in Christendom?* The supposition is against reason. On purely historical grounds, therefore, the conclusion is already inevitable, that the integral Assumption was believed and taught in the Catholic Church at a period indefinitely earlier than the sixth century. And on theological grounds we are again entitled, without going further, to conclude to the Apostolic origin of the doctrine, according to the well-known principle, "quod apud multos unum invenitur non est erratum, sed traditum." †

III. But although the categorical assertion of the corporal Assumption cannot be traced with certainty beyond the sixth century, nor with probability beyond the fifth, yet the doctrine is no less clearly, though indirectly, traceable in the Fathers up to the fourth century. We find S. Isidore of Seville (636), S. Epiphanius (403), S. Ambrose (397), doubting or even denying that the Blessed Virgin had ever paid the debt of nature. Commenting on the text, "And thy own soul a sword shall pierce," S. Isidore writes: "No history relates expressly that Mary perished by the sword, since not even her death is anywhere read of, nor yet the place of her sepulture found."‡ S. Epiphanius gives theological as well as historical reasons for doubting Mary's death. "I do not determine," he says, "that she has remained immortal, nor am I able to establish whether she is deceased. For Holy Scripture, overstepping the reach of the human mind, has left the point uncertain for the honour of that precious and excellent vessel, lest any should ascribe to it any foulness proper to flesh. Whether, therefore, Mary is dead or buried we know not. Nevertheless, she did not experience any bodily stain,—far be it from us to think so."§ S. Ambrose

---

* Cf. S. Thom. Sum. Theol., iii. 27, 1; Dom. Soto in 4 Sent. xliii. 2, 1; Melchior Cano de Loc. Theol., xii. 9; Thomassinus de Festis, ii. 20; Suarez in III. Thom. Disp. xxi. sect. 2, a. 4, n. 9, &c. &c.

† Tertullian, De Præscript., cap. 38.

‡ The passage of S. Isidore we borrow from Vaccari (p. 144):—"Specialiter nulla docet historia Mariam gladii animadversione peremptam, quia nec obiter uspiam legitur, dum tamen nec reperitur sepultura."—*Isid. Hisp. de Vit. et Mort. Sanc.*, cap. 18, apud Vaccari.

§ The passage of Epiphanius is so well known that we shall run no risk by quoting it in Latin. It is too long to be cited entire. . . . "Neque aut immortalem perseverasse definio, aut utrum mortua sit confirmare possum. Quippe Scriptura Sacra, mentis humanæ captum prætergressa rem in incerto reliquit, propter vas illud eximium et præstans, ne quis carnis propriam ullam ei fœditatem adscribat. Sive igitur mortua sit Maria nescimus sive consepulta. Non tamen ullam est maculam corporis experta, absit ut illud existimemus." —*S. Epiph. Hær.*, 78.

has the original of the sentence in Isidore. "Neither Scripture nor history relates that Mary departed this life by suffering bodily martyrdom; for the soul, not the body, is transpierced by a material sword. And therefore (the text) declares the prudence of Mary, who knew full well the heavenly mystery."* And although S. Ambrose speaks directly of death by martyrdom only, yet, as we have just seen, S. Isidore interprets him of death in general, and his contemporary, S. Epiphanius, puts his real thought into full light. Nor can it be said that their only reason for doubting arose from the silence of history as to the fact of Mary's death and the place of her burial. Had this been indeed the case, it might be said, with some show of plausibility, that their opinion was of little consequence for or against the Assumption. But, as Epiphanius clearly witnesses, the real cause of doubt lay much deeper. It was no other than the difficulty of reconciling the fact of death with the honour which they knew to be due to Mary's body. It was the feeling so forcibly expressed somewhere by one of the Fathers:—"Corpus Virginis vermibus traditum, quia sentire non valeo, dicere perhorresco." These Fathers saw that death led to corruption. They were clear that dissolution could not assail the flesh of Her who "was always to be left out of the case when sin was in question:" they were not clear on the distinction between death as a condition of human nature, and death as a punishment of sin; hence they concluded that Mary had been translated to glory without undergoing the separation of soul and body,—that is, had been integrally assumed into heaven. This is the immediate consequence and only legitimate explanation of language such as that of Epiphanius. Those who held it were well aware that the Catholic Church knows no place of abode of members of the human family since the Ascension of our Lord, except heaven, earth, purgatory, and hell. When, therefore, the Fathers expressed themselves as quite certain that the body of the Mother of God had not been given up as a prey to worms, and as doubtful whether she had died or no, their words could have but one meaning, viz., that they were not sure whether it had pleased God to take His Mother to Himself without the usual separation of soul and body, or immediately after that event. And we have here, besides the real explanation of the persistence in asserting the death of the Blessed Virgin

* "Nec littera nec historia docet, ex hac vita Mariam corporalis necis passione migrasse; non enim anima sed corpus materiali gladio transverberatur. Et ideo prudentiam Mariæ haud ignaram mysterii cœlestis ostendit."—*S. Ambros. Expos. in Luc.*, lib. ii. *n.* 61, tom. ii. *Opp.* Paris, 1853.

observable in Beleth, in Usuard, and so many others, and especially in the Church herself.*

Here, then, is a second and independent tradition, positive, though indirect, of our doctrine. It carries us into the fourth century, and at that date is met with in East and West. Let it now be joined with that negative argument to which it points. Not only was it true in the time of S. Epiphanius that the burial-place of the Mother of God was unknown; but neither before his time nor since has any one alleged that there exists on earth a relic of her body. Not only so. When the Blessed Virgin's tomb was said to have been discovered, and no longer any doubt of her death remained, the absence of the body was, from the first, constantly and universally asserted. Let these facts be taken in connection with the well-known *cultus* of relics in the earliest ages, as testified by Holy Scripture and the Acts of the Martyrs, or with this other fact, which has its own independent force as an argument, namely, that we claim to possess, at this day, relics of the body of almost every Saint of the apostolic age. Once again, we are constrained either to admit the truth and apostolic origin of the doctrine, or to acquiesce in the singular conclusion, that the Christian Church, while taking extraordinary precautions for the safe custody of the relics of all her Saints, took no heed whatever of the relics of the Queen of Saints, and utterly neglected that body which, alone of all, she knew to be incorrupt; and alone of all, could claim close consanguinity with the Son of God. The latter supposition is simply incredible; the former must therefore be accepted. On Catholic principles, therefore, we are able to conclude with certainty to the apostolic origin of the tradition of the integral Assumption of the Mother of God. We are entitled to do so on two grounds, either of them sufficient to support the conclusion. For we have shown, and, as we hope, conclusively, the consent of the Church of the present time in the doctrine, and equally the same consent for many centuries past. As we are not, however, writing for theological readers only, but for that general public which has not been deeply initiated into the mysteries of the *loci theologici*, we are bound to say a word of the bridge which enables us to pass so lightly over three centuries. The bridge is, of course, no other than the fundamental principle of the Catholic rule of faith, viz., that the living Church of any age infallibly knows how to distinguish between genuine and spurious traditions, and hence can never, in her universality, receive and

* See the Secret Prayer for the Mass of Assumption above cited, and the passages of Usuard and Beleth.

teach, as appertaining to the deposit, what is not therein contained, either explicitly in itself, or implicitly in other truths from which it logically flows. This infallible discernment of the Church of all ages is the sole and sufficient ground for affirming that the doctrine of the Assumption, as understood in the nineteenth century, was a part of the original revelation made to the apostles. But how, it will be asked, is a silence of centuries to be accounted for? It is evident that a complete answer to this question would involve a treatise on development of doctrine, and would carry us far beyond the limits of the present inquiry. It is sufficient, in this place, to distinguish between a tradition in itself and the mode of its preservation. A tradition, to be apostolic, must have existed in the Church from the beginning. But its outward manifestation is by no means necessary in all ages. Still less is it necessary, at any given period, to be able to show evidence of its having been explicitly taught, or even believed, in each succeeding age. This would be to require, as part of the divine scheme, the existence and preservation, through all time, of written records of every age sufficient to attest each particular doctrine; a requirement altogether contrary to the genius of the Christian revelation, which was to be handed down from generation to generation by articulately-speaking men; and no less contrary to the actual course of God's providence, which has permitted the greater portion of the records of whole centuries to perish. It is conceivable therefore, and even to be expected, that, for reasons purely extrinsic and accidental, this or that apostolic tradition had left no traces of its existence during an indefinite period. And this might be true of a tradition openly professed throughout its course. *A fortiori* a tradition imparted but to few, or only in germ, wrapped up in recondite analogies of faith, and not brought into prominence by early contradiction, might lie in obscurity for centuries and yet be there, until at last brought to the surface, perhaps by an event which looks like an accident. The Assumption was just one of these traditions. The fact was explicitly told the Church by the apostles, and was implied in other truths by their ministry revealed. The recollection of the fact was buried in the ruins of Jerusalem, which covered the empty tomb. The necessary readiness of mind to accept the fact when afterwards brought again to light, was preserved by the explicit belief of the connected truths. The finding of the tomb in the fifth century was the providential occasion of the promulgation of the doctrine which had to wait for universal acceptance only until its bearings had been fully mastered.

Here we take leave of the purely historical and critical side of our subject. We have dwelt so long upon this branch of the

inquiry, because it has been considered, by many, the weak point in the case; and because it was the point of attack chosen by "Janus," whose captious and superficial observations were the immediate, indirect occasion of this article. The paramount claims of brevity and simplicity in a paper of this kind have prevented us from making use of the Euthymian history, the letter of Juvenal, the writings of Pseudo-Melito, Pseudo-John, and the Areopagite.* Scientifically, indeed, the cause has lost by those omissions; but, controversially, at all events, there has been gain. For none can allege that the tradition, as here set forth, is supported by doubtful argument, or based upon forgery. And yet we have traced landmarks of the doctrine all the way to the fourth century; that is, almost to the very era of persecution. How many undoubted truths there are in connection with the Sacraments, for instance, the traces of which are not found by any means so early! The doctrine, for example, that a Sacrament of the New Law must be of divine institution, cannot have been fully developed at an early period when a theologian like Alexander Halensis was able to write that Confirmation was instituted in a provincial Council at Meaux in the ninth century.

IV. The integral Assumption is contained in one at least of the two great rules of faith. Is there any trace of the doctrine in the other? Does Holy Scripture tell us anything about it? It does; and a good deal. We cannot here follow out the argument in detail, an undertaking which would demand an article for itself, but we must at least indicate some heads of reasoning.

The pervading argument of all Scripture, and especially of the writings of S. Paul (Gen. iii.; Sap. ii. 23, 24; Osee, xii. 14.; Rom. v. 12, *seqq.;* 1 Cor. xv. 24-26, 54-57; Heb. iv. 14, 15; etc.), is the doctrine of the fall and redemption of the human race. The actors in that great drama are six: the Serpent (or Lucifer), Adam and Eve, Gabriel, Mary, and Christ. In the first act Lucifer is victorious over Eve, and through her, over Adam; in the second he is conquered by Christ, and Mary is

* We may, however, remark, incidentally, that criticism has not yet said its last word on the works of the Areopagite. Mgrs. Darboy and Freppel have both recently undertaken the rehabilitation of those much-vexed books. The treatise of Pseudo-Melito, also, is placed by Tischendorf not later than the fourth century—not, as Janus places it, in the fifth or sixth. We may also be allowed to observe, in general, that but little criticism or philosophy is shown in the apparently prevalent notion that no account need be taken of an apocryphal book simply because it is apocryphal. Some explanation, which shall not be in flagrant contradiction with probability, is needed of the fact that a writer, as early as the fourth century, could hope to pass off, as genuine, a work bearing the name of S. John the Evangelist, and describing the resurrection and assumption of the Blessed Virgin, as a faithful copy of the resurrection and ascension of her Son.

made partner in the victory. For, as Eve consented to the defeat, and by her consent contributed thereto, so Mary (Luke i. 38) consented to the Incarnation as the means of overcoming Satan, and by her consent contributed, in like manner and degree, to the victory. The effects of Satan's victory immediately affecting mankind were three; sin, or man's rebellion against his lawful superior—Almighty God; concupiscence, or the rebellion of the lower against the higher powers in man himself; and, finally, the consequence of concupiscence, death, or the complete dissolution of the union of soul and body. In other words, sin dissolved the moral union between man and God; concupiscence, the moral union of all the human faculties; death, the physical union of soul and body, which could not be preserved without the moral basis. The fruits of Christ's victory were the reverse of these effects. He triumphed over sin; over concupiscence, its daughter; and over death, the hideous progeny of both. As Eve had an integral part in the defeat, so Mary in the victory.* And as all the effects of the defeat passed upon Eve as united to Adam, so all the fruits of victory fell to Mary from her association with Jesus. By her Immaculate Conception she reaped the fruit of victory over sin; by her Virginal motherhood she shared the victory over concupiscence; and by her integral Assumption she had her part in the victory over the "last enemy, death." If the Blessed Virgin's body has been suffered to await the resurrection, her triumph over Satan is not yet complete; the last scene of the drama is not yet played; and the Scriptures are "made void." But the Word of God is not made void. The triumph, which was prophesied by Moses, was seen already accomplished by the last of the inspired writers, the "beloved disciple" of Jesus and Mary's guardian. "The temple of God in heaven" (writes S. John, Apoc. xi. 19; xii. 1, *seqq.*) "was opened, and the Ark of the covenant was seen in his temple. . . . And a great sign appeared in heaven: A woman clothed with the Sun, and the Moon under her feet; and on her head a crown of twelve stars. And being with child, she cried, travailing in birth, and was in pain to be delivered. And there was seen another sign in heaven; and behold a great red dragon . . . and the dragon stood before the woman who was ready to be delivered, that, when she should be delivered, he might devour her son. And she brought forth a man-child, who was to rule all

* We hope our Protestant readers will understand that no part of this reasoning is founded on the *ipsa* which they consider a perversion of Gen. iii. 15. It makes no difference, whatever, to the force of the Protevangelium, as an argument for Mary's exaltation, whether we read *ipsa* or *ipsum*, which latter we ourselves believe to be the true reading. Let not Dr. Pusey, therefore, raise an outcry which has no meaning.

nations with an iron rod; and her son was taken up to God and to His throne. And the woman fled into the wilderness." Dr. Newman has lately, and in a controversial work, interpreted the latter part of this text of the Blessed Virgin. We have pleasure in quoting his authority, and, in order not to miss any part of its force, we give the passage entire:—

I do not deny, of course, that, under the image of the Woman, the Church is signified; but what I would maintain is this, that the Holy Apostle would not have spoken of the Church under this particular image, *unless* there had existed a Blessed Virgin Mary, who was exalted on high, and the object of veneration to all the faithful.

No one doubts that the "man-child" spoken of is an allusion to our Lord: why then is not "the Woman" an allusion to His Mother? This surely is the obvious sense of the words; of course it [*sic*] has a further sense also, which is the scope of the image; doubtless the child represents the children of the Church. This, I grant, is the real or direct sense [may not both images be intermixed, so that in some parts the direct sense shall refer to Jesus and Mary, and in others to the Church and the faithful? Such double references are common in the prophecies concerning our Lord, *e.g.*, 2 Kings vii. 14]; but what is the sense of the symbol? *Who* are the woman and the child? I answer, They are not personifications, but persons. This is true of the child, therefore it is true of the woman.

But again: not only mother and child, but a serpent is introduced into the vision. Such a meeting of man, woman, and serpent has not been found in Scripture, since the beginning of Scripture, and now it is found in its end. Moreover, in the passage in the Apocalypse, as if to supply before Scripture came to an end what was wanting in its beginning, we are told, and for the first time, that the serpent in Paradise was the evil spirit. If the dragon of S. John is the same as the serpent of Moses, and the man-child is "the seed of the woman," why is not the woman herself she, whose seed the man-child is? And, if the first woman is not an allegory, why is the second? If the first woman is Eve, why is not the second Mary?

But this is not all. The image of the woman, according to Scripture usage, is too bold and prominent for a mere personification. Scripture is not fond of allegories. We have, indeed, frequent figures there, as when the sacred writers speak of the arm or sword of the Lord; and so too when they speak of Jerusalem and Samaria in the feminine; or of the mountains leaping for joy, or of the Church as a bride or as a vine; but they are not much given to dressing up abstract ideas or generalizations in personal attributes. This is the classical rather than the Scriptural style. Xenophon places Hercules between Virtue and Vice, represented as women; Æschylus introduces into his drama Force and Violence; Virgil gives personality to public rumour or Fame, and Plautus to Poverty. So on monuments done in the classical style, we see virtues, vices, rivers, renown, death, and the like turned into human figures of men and women. I do not say there are no instances at all of this method in Scripture, but I say that such poetical compositions are strikingly unlike its usual method. Thus we at once feel

its difference from Scripture, when we betake ourselves to the Pastor of Hermes, and find the Church a woman; to S. Methodius, and find Virtue a woman; and to S. Gregory's poem, and find Virginity again a woman. Scripture deals with types rather than personifications. Israel stands for the chosen people, David for Christ, Jerusalem for heaven. Consider the remarkable representations, dramatic I may call them, in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Hosea; predictions, threatenings, and promises, are acted out by those prophets. Ezekiel is commanded to shave his head, and to divide and scatter his hair; and Ahias tears his garment, and gives ten out of twelve parts of it to Jeroboam. So, too, the structure of the imagery in the Apocalypse is not a mere allegorical creation, but is founded on the Jewish ritual. In like manner, our Lord's bodily cures are visible types of the power of His grace upon the soul; and His prophecy of the last day is conveyed under that of the fall of Jerusalem. Even His parables are not simply ideal, but relations of occurrences, which did or might take place, under which was conveyed a spiritual meaning. The description of Wisdom in the Proverbs, and other sacred books, has brought out the instinct of commentators in this respect. They felt that Wisdom could not be a mere personification, and they determined that it was our Lord; and the later of these books, by their own definite language, warranted that interpretation. Then, when it was found that the Arians used it in derogation of our Lord's divinity, still, unable to tolerate the notion of a mere allegory, commentators applied the description to the Blessed Virgin. Coming back then to the Apocalyptic vision, I ask, If the woman must be some real person, who can it be whom the Apostle saw, and intends, and delineates, but that same Great Mother to whom the chapters in the Proverbs are accommodated? And let it be observed, moreover, that in this passage, from the allusion in it to the history of the fall, she may be said still to be represented under the character of the Second Eve. I make a further remark: it is sometimes asked, Why do not the sacred writers mention our Lady's greatness? I answer, she was, or may have been alive, when the Apostles and Evangelists wrote;—there was just one book of Scripture certainly written after her death, and that book does (if I may so speak) canonize her.*

Dr. Newman, however, was not the first to see Mary in "the woman clothed with the sun." S. Epiphanius had already interpreted the passage in the same way; and our readers have seen the passage of Cyril Lucar to the same purpose. They will also have already seen from S. Thomas, S. Bernard, and S. John of Damascus, that the true "ark of the covenant" is no other than the Virgin Mother's body, which bore the Lord of all. Now, the obvious sense of the text is certainly that S. John had a vision of heaven, in which he saw Jesus and His

* A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon, p. 62, fol. Compare Essay on Doctrinal Development, p. 384; and Dr. Ullathorne on the Immaculate Conception, p. 77, referred to in the Letter.

Mother in the flesh. It would, indeed, be possible, and even easy, to interpret the passage otherwise, were it not to be taken in connection with the great argument sketched above, as the result, not of one text of Scripture, but of scores. There is consequently not only no reason for rejecting the obvious interpretation, but a most strong reason for accepting it, nay even for insisting upon it. We claim therefore to find Our Lady's bodily exaltation in Scripture, and in no obscure manner. And in doing so we are only following the traditional interpretation of all passages which refer to the first argument, and if the patristic authority for the interpretation which we have given of the Apocalypse is small, neither is the reason far to seek. The number of patristic comments on that book is by no means large, and, moreover, the genius of the book, prophetical and full of imagery as it is, is such that a considerable theological development of doctrine is necessary as a preparation to its interpretation. And, even at this day, the greater part of the vision is still a sealed book, whose contents are only to be guessed at from its title and surroundings.

There is another Scripture doctrine which also points to an anticipated resurrection of the Mother of God. The resurrection of the just is an imitation of the resurrection of Jesus, and stands to it in the relation of effect to cause (1 Cor. xv. per totum; 1 Thess. iv.). The bodies of men rise at the last day by virtue of their union with the body of Christ (John vi. 55–59). "Who eats my flesh and drinks my blood, has life eternal: and I will raise him up at the last day. . . . Who eats me shall live on account of me. This is the bread which came down from heaven. Not as your fathers ate manna and died. Who eats this bread shall live for ever." Now, as between the flesh of Jesus and of Mary, there existed not a union but a unity. The maternal relation constituted an association altogether singular and special. There should therefore be something in the resurrection of the Blessed Virgin to correspond to the special nature of her union with Jesus. What that something really is we have ample means of judging from all that has been said up to this point. The resurrection of Mary was the same in kind as that of all the just. It differed from theirs by two circumstances, the one connected with the Immaculate Conception, the other with the Divine Maternity. Mary's resurrection was without the antecedent corruption of her body, because she was free from the original stain; and was without delay, because of the union with her risen Son peculiar to herself alone.

We have now arrived at the term of our investigation into

the ecclesiastical records, inspired and uninspired. The inquiry has taught us that the doctrine of the corporal Assumption is contained both expressly and by implication in both rules of faith. That doctrine is therefore *remotely* definable. Is it also *proximately* capable of definition? Has the Church put the seal of her sanction on our reasonings from Holy Scripture and tradition? This is the last stage of our journey, and not a long one.

V. If we place ourselves in the year preceding the definition of the Immaculate Conception, we find the Schola unanimous in putting the integral Assumption and Immaculate Conception in the same grade of certainty.* The Assumption was even more certain extrinsically than the Immaculate Conception. For it was doubted by none, and the Immaculate Conception was inferred from it as from a truth universally recognized. Arguing from effect to cause, theologians proved demonstratively that, since Mary had conquered death, she must also have been free from the sin "by which death came into the world." But not only the theologians reasoned thus; the Church herself connected as mutually dependent Our Lady's death with her Conception.† In condemning the proposition, that the Blessed Virgin's death was a punishment of Adam's sin, she affirmed indirectly that Mary's death was unlike that of the rest of mankind; that is, she affirmed indirectly that the second Eve was not included in the sentence—"dust thou art, and into dust thou shalt return,"—but was partner with her Son in his victory over him who "had the empire (Κρατος) of death, that is to say, the devil." The Church has therefore officially endorsed and given an extrinsic value to those theological reasonings which have resulted in finding the Assumption revealed in the Protevangelium.

Again: let us take the converse of what we have just said. We have just seen that the Church prepared the way for the definition of the Immaculate Conception by a declaration that

---

* Cf. S. Thom., Sum. Theol. III. 27, l. c.; Dom. Soto, in 4 Sent. Dist. XLIII. q. 2, a. 1; Suarez, l. c.; Gotti, de Verit. Relig. XLI., sect. 2; et TT. passim.

† "Nemo, præter Christum, est absque peccato originali: *hinc* Beata Virgo mortua est propter peccatum ex Adamo contractum, omnesque ejus afflictiones in hac vita, sicut et aliorum justorum, fuerunt ultiones peccati actualis vel originalis."—*Prop.* 73, *inter Baianas.* (*Denzinger, Enchir.*, ed. 4, n. 953.) It is to be observed that three propositions are here directly condemned. 1. No one, save Christ, is without original sin. 2. Hence the Blessed Virgin died on account of sin contracted from Adam. 3. Hence all her afflictions in this life, as also those of the rest of the just, were punishments of sin actual or original.

Mary's death was not caused by sin. If we turn now to the Immaculate Conception, we shall see that the definition of that dogma opens a short and easy path to a definition of the Assumption. The argument is simple and decisive. We will put it in as few words as possible. It is certain *de fide Catholica*, that the Blessed Virgin has been, by a special grace of God, preserved from all taint of original sin.* It is also certain *de fide Catholica*, that death, with the subsequent dissolution of the body, is a consequence and punishment of original sin.† Therefore it is certain, and certain *de fide*, that the Blessed Mary was not subject to death in the way in which that penalty has fallen on the rest of mankind.‡ It will be said, perhaps, that if this argument proves anything, it proves too much; for if death is an effect of sin, and Mary was free from sin, how comes it that she did not escape death?

We cannot here inquire into the reasons from the economy of the Incarnation, which explains the fitness of Our Lady's death, and its place in the mystery of Redemption. It must, for the present, suffice to explain that death has two aspects. It is both a condition of human nature and a punishment of Adam's sin. In the order of Providence preceding the fall, the preternatural gift of immortality of the body was granted to the human race. But in the order of Redemption, to which the Blessed Virgin belongs, that privilege has not been accorded. Hence, although Mary was, by the perfection of her Redemption, exempt from the purely penal part of death, the corruption of the tomb, and delayed resurrection, yet was she, as her Divine Son also, none the less liable to the natural decay of the human organization, and finally to the separation of soul and body. And here is the force of the argument. Mary is certainly dead; she is as certainly not under the power of death, because she was perfectly redeemed; that is, she was preserved from sin and all its penal consequences, one of which is the delay of resurrection, until the end of the world. She is therefore certainly risen; and if it is asked, Whither has she ascended? the nature of the case and the tradition of the Catholic Church answer—She is gone up into Heaven.

---

* Pius IX., Bulla *Ineffabilis*. Denzinger, edit. 4, n. 1502.

† Conc. Milev. II., Can. 1; Araus. II., Can. 2; Trid. Sess. V., Can. 1; Denzinger, l. c., nn. 64, 145, 670.

‡ On the quality of a conclusion drawn from two revealed premisses, see Suarez *de Fide*, Disp. III., sect. 11.; and de Lugo *de Fide*, Disp. I., sect. 13. The reader will have noticed the implied distinction between *fides objectiva* and *fides Catholica*. What has been revealed to the Church by Almighty God is *fides objectiva*; only those truths which have been proposed to the faithful by the Church are *fides Catholica*.

Apart, then, from the clear tokens of the mind of the Church of the present day, which we dwelt upon at length at the beginning of this paper, it is plain that preceding definitions have paved the way for a declaration on the subject of the Assumption. That doctrine is, extrinsically as well as intrinsically, definable. It is not only contained in Scripture and Tradition, but is involved in already existing definitions, and especially in that of the Immaculate Conception.

We have now made good, as we think, the statements to which we had committed ourselves. It only remains to indicate one or two reasons which seem to point to the present council as a fitting occasion for a definition of the doctrine.

First, then, the definition of the Assumption would complete the circle of Mary's glories. It is an integral part of the Marian system, which is itself an integral part of the Incarnation and Redemption, the central mysteries of the Christian faith as such. The definition of the Assumption is as much needed to round off the Marian theology, as the definition of the two wills and operations in Christ was needed to perfect the doctrine on the Hypostatic Union. And it would be a great glory to scientific theology, and a great consolation to its professors, if a "pious belief," which has its roots so deep down in the analogies of faith, and is logically connected with so many other doctrines of faith, were to receive the final sanction of a definition. Secondly, the intimate connection between the Assumption and the Immaculate Conception seems to require that both truths should be put on the same footing of certainty. The "opinion" of the Assumption furnished a strong argument for the truth of the Immaculate Conception. The time has now come when the dogma of the Immaculate Conception can hold out a hand to the doctrine which is its legitimate consequence. Thirdly, the Council of the Vatican was convoked, and is now sitting, under the patronage of Mary Immaculate. It would seem a most graceful act of homage, if the Holy Council should return thanks to the Queen of Heaven, and through her to Divine Providence, for the marvellous and unprecedented mercies which have so far attended its convocation and celebration, by a solemn declaration that the Catholic Church believes and teaches the integral Assumption of the Mother of God as a part of divine revelation. Lastly, a definition seems to be called for to stop the spread of such ideas, as we quoted at the beginning of this paper, from the Encyclopédie de Théologie.

With all our hearts, therefore, we join in the hope and prayer that the Holy Synod may see fit, in its wisdom, to honour the Holy Trinity, to glorify the Immaculate Mother of God, to

rejoice the Church—triumphant, militant, and suffering,—and confound her enemies, by a dogmatic decree declaring the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary to be an article of Catholic faith.

Art. VI.—JANE AUSTEN AND HER NOVELS.

A Memoir of Jane Austen. By her Nephew, J. E. Austen Leigh, Vicar of Bray, Berks. London: Richard Bentley.

JANE AUSTEN was buried in Winchester Cathedral, near the centre of the north aisle, almost opposite the beautiful chantry tomb of William of Wykeham, on the 24th of July, 1817. A few years ago, a gentleman, visiting Winchester Cathedral, desired to be shown Miss Austen's grave. The verger, as he pointed it out, asked: "Pray, sir, can you tell me whether there was anything particular about that lady; so many people want to know where she was buried?" Her nephew, writing a memoir of her, demanded by public interest and curiosity, fifty-two years after her death, says: "During her life the ignorance of the verger was shared by most people; few knew that 'there was anything particular about that lady.'"

That lady, to whom some fame had come during her lifetime, but who had avoided publicity, and so meekly worn her honours, that her own family "never thought of her as being clever, still less as being famous," but, as the dear "Aunt Jane," who was the delight of her nephews and nieces, was the author of six novels which stand absolutely alone in English literature, and for which only an increase of admiration is to be anticipated in proportion to the increase in the number and varieties of works of fiction to accumulate in the future, and be submitted, such, at least, as are not utterly ephemeral and worthless—to a comparison with them. To many readers these books have, doubtless, been an abiding source of pleasure; but it is certain that the general recognition of Miss Austen's rank as a novelist, the far and wide revival of her fame is a recent movement of taste and criticism. The natural result of this general recognition is a desire to know more of the writer, to learn particulars of her life, and trace the inspirations and influences to which such

works were due. This is precisely what Mr. Austen Leigh's memoir of his aunt enables us to do. Meagre in details, simple in style, scrupulously moderate in tone, and commencing with an admission that his materials are so scanty as to be hardly available for even a faint outline of the desired portraiture; he yet gives us a picture which shows us Miss Austen's home, her surroundings, the moral atmosphere in which she lived; and makes us recognise the realism of her workmanship. "Of events," says the author of the memoir, "her life was singularly barren: few changes and no great crisis ever broke the smooth current of its course. Even her fame may be said to be posthumous, it did not attain to any vigorous life till she had ceased to exist. Her talents did not introduce her to the notice of other writers, or connect her with the literary world, or in any degree pierce through the obscurity of her domestic retirement." She was, in fact, one of those fortunate women who have no history, whose quiet place is in the hearts of a few who love them, who use their talents, of whatever order they be, with diligence and humility, untouched by the disease of vanity, and the unhealthy craving for publicity, which in the present day makes it exceedingly doubtful whether exceptional intellectual endowments are to be regarded as advantageous to the women who possess them, or to their families and friends. The time in which Miss Austen lived was more favourable to the life of quiet seclusion which she led, than the present, no doubt; but she could have had display if she had desired it. The fussy flattery which made the "little Burney" a lamentable spectacle to sensible members of society, would have been at Miss Austen's disposal if she had been capable of accepting it, and the mania for corresponding with authors, and other distinguished persons, of which Miss Mitford had such plenteous experience,—a custom now replaced by "interviewing"—would have found food in her, had there been any weak point in her armour of good sense. With the impression of her character made by this admirable memoir full upon one, and the ever-present remembrance of all her writings, it is amusing to find her shrinking with comic horror from a meeting with Madame de Staël. The order-loving, gentle, pretty English lady, who was, withal, one of the acutest humourists who ever drew immortal pictures with pen and ink, combined in a lionising exhibition with the tawdry Corinne, hungry of ovations, and subversive as a declamatory member of the *Sorosis* of to-day, would have been an incongruity which must have left a sense of pain and discord to linger in her sensitive and well-balanced mind. Sir James Mackintosh

mentions that Madame de Staël could see nothing to interest her in one of Miss Austen's novels,—which he recommended to her —and remarked that it was "*vulgaire.*" To this characteristic comment, Sir James Mackintosh replied: "There is no book which that word would so little suit." Vulgarity is, indeed, the last attribute which could co-exist with such native truthfulness of observation, perfect good sense, and incapability of exaggeration or affectation as hers.

Miss Austen lived forty-two years, and her literary life lasted half that time. It adds to the impression created by the sense, discretion, observation, and humour displayed in her first novels, "Pride and Prejudice," and "Sense and Sensibility," to know that they were written when she was but twenty-one years old. She was born in December 1775, at the Parsonage House, (since destroyed) of Steventon, in Hampshire. Her father was rector of the united parishes of Deane and Steventon, and her life knew but three migrations, from Steventon to Bath, where her father died; thence to Southampton, and ultimately to Chawton, whence her novels were sent into the world, though three of them had been written long before. The circumstances of the country clergyman's family were comfortable and respectable; their society and surroundings of the order which Miss Austen reproduces in her novels. Of her four brothers, two were distinguished members of the naval service, the sole subject connected with public affairs for which Miss Austen seems to have cared. Her strongest attachment was to her sister Cassandra. In simple language, which has something of the ring of Miss Austen's own style in it, her nephew tells us how this happy home was constituted, and thus concludes the sketch. "This attachment was never weakened or interrupted. They lived in the same home, and shared the same bedroom, till separated by death. They were not exactly alike. Cassandra's was the colder and calmer disposition; she was always prudent and well-judging, but with less outward demonstration of feeling and less seriousness of temper than Jane possessed ..... This was the small circle, continually enlarged, however, by the increasing families of four of her brothers, within which Jane Austen found her wholesome pleasures, duties, and interests, and beyond which she went very little into society during the last ten years of her life. There was so much that was agreeable in this family party that its members may be excused if they were inclined to live somewhat too exclusively within it. They might see in each other much to love and esteem, and something to admire. The family talk had abundance of spirit and vivacity, and was

never troubled by disagreement even in little matters, for it was not their habit to dispute or argue with each other; above all, there was strong family affection and firm union, never to be broken but by death. It cannot be doubted that all this had its influence on the author in the construction of her stories, in which a family usually supplies the narrow stage, while the interest is made to revolve round a few actors."

The inanimate objects, which in those days went to the composition of an English lady's home, were very different from those familiar to us. Mr. Austen Leigh alludes to this difference pleasantly, when he describes his aunt's homely useful life. She was remarkable for her skill in needlework, of the plain household kind, of which some exquisitely neat specimens are preserved in the family, and her work-box, and little well-worn mahogany desk, on which those brilliant books were written, had their places on the large general table in the family sitting-room which boasted one sofa, never approached by the younger members of the family,—and in which arm-chairs were unknown. The sisters walked out in pattens, and the impress of these country walks, with their glimpses of somewhat tame beauty, and their inspiriting effect, is to be found in the story of the lives of Elinor and Marianne Dashwood, of Fanny Price, and of Jane and Lizzy Bennet. She wrote with ease, and never adopted any of the affectations of authorship, but pursued her occupation freely in the family circle, frequently with her nephews and nieces playing about the room. Her face was as bright as her temper, her voice was as sweet as her manners, her habits were scrupulously neat and orderly, but neither she nor her sister had any taste for dress, and they both "took to the garb of middle age sooner than their years or their looks required." The only allusions to dress to be found in her novels are put into the mouths of the women, respecting whom, of the number depicted with her peculiar and perfect humour, she evidently entertained the lowest opinion. Mrs. Bennet, in "Pride and Prejudice," Mrs. Elton in "Emma," and that superlative fool, of whom she gives us just enough to be delightfully amusing, while dexterously implying how intolerable any more of her would be, Mrs. Allen in "Northanger Abbey.

It does not appear that Miss Austen was a great reader. She was not an accomplished person; but she was well educated, according to the standard of her time. She read French with facility, and she knew something of Italian. Of historical writers, she had studied Goldsmith, Hume, and Robertson, but does not appear to have cared about them. She lived in stir-

ring times, when Europe was in commotion, and England neither desired nor contrived to hold aloof from the general interests of mankind. Her own country was at war, and France was undergoing a succession of revolutions; but there is no reference to any public event in her works, and the only political opinions or feelings imputed to her were confined to the history of the affairs of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Even in them, it was only "as a girl" that she was interested. She studied Richardson with a delight and intensity, which even Mr. Dallas's eloquent panegyric, backed up by Macaulay and Thackeray, will not revive in these days. Her own novels have that transcendent charm, resulting from their artistic completeness, their self-contained excellence, unindebted to any accessories, that they can never be out of date. Her extreme pleasure in Richardson's novels is a strong testimony to the real merit in them, overlaid with such tedious repetition, and such exaggerated and fulsome sentiment; for these defects are precisely those from which her own writings are pre-eminently free. They are, indeed, the converse of her most salient characteristics, and must have been peculiarly displeasing to her. "Every circumstance narrated in 'Sir Charles Grandison,'" says Mr. Austen Leigh, "all that was said or done in the cedar parlour, was familiar to her; and the wedding-days of Lord L. and Lady G. were as well remembered as if they had been living friends." This is the sort of feeling which Mr. Charles Dickens's earlier works inspired in the present generation, and which Miss Austen's own novels inspire. We can read "Clarissa," when an accomplished critic explains to us that we really ought; but can we read "Evelina," "Cecilia," or "Camilla"? Could we read them, even under the influence of Macaulay's beguiling essay upon Madame d'Arblay? * Could we read any of the novels written by Miss Austen's female contemporaries or almost contemporaries? Even Miss Ferrier is difficult to read now. Bits, here and there, from "Marriage," "The Inheritance," and "Destiny," have a racy flavour; but, as a whole, the books are gone by. Yet the six novels written by Miss Austen, will probably be as congenial to the taste of the next century as to the taste of this. Her sayings have the pertinence, the pungency, and the polish of proverbs; her wit is never of circumstance merely. Her witticisms are not only witty in

* Dr. Johnson's patronage led the "little Burney" into the absurd error of imitating his grandiloquent manner. If Miss Austen had come under his notice, we are sure the circumstance would not have infected her style with a silly inflation.

the mouths of the persons who utter them—though they are not broad-cast, without appropriateness, like Sheridan's epigrams; but they owe nothing to the influence of the day. They have not the smallest approximation to or kindred with any kind of slang. Of how few humorous writers can the same be said. Would it not be almost as difficult to read Theodore Hook's novels now as Miss Burney's, and Mrs. Brunton's, and Mrs. Opie's? Yet we may predict, as confidently as we hope, that no readers of any future age will fail to appreciate Miss Austen's humour, which, for drollery of conception and felicity of expression, may be compared with that of Oliver Goldsmith.

In a certain sense Miss Austen may be said to have been wanting in imagination, an impression which is increased by the unremitting action of her judgment upon her works. She never outstepped the boundaries within which she believed her ability to lie. She described neither places nor events beyond her knowledge. There might have been for her no world outside the villages in which her people live. London she hardly touches upon, except in a few passages in "Pride and Prejudice," and "Sense and Sensibility," which have no local colouring. Bath is her largest and fullest sphere, and she studied the topography of the town so closely, that she described it with perfect accuracy in "Northanger Abbey" before she had ever been there. It must have been pleasant to verify her description, to find that Pulteney Street and Edgar's Buildings stood exactly where she had placed them; and that John Thorpe, on his way to Mrs. Allen's lodgings, might easily have seen Mr. Tilney turn up Lansdown Road. The creation of character, not of incident, was her *forte;* and the completeness, the consistency, the delicacy of touch with which she executed her portraits, are unsurpassed, as is the judgment with which she allots to each individual his or her share in the story, not giving too much or too little space to any, rising above the fascinating temptation of her own wit, and rarely suffering her delightful eccentricities to preponderate. The instances in which Miss Austen indulged in caricature are but two in number: that of Mr. Collins in "Pride and Prejudice," and that of Robert Ferrars in "Sense and Sensibility;" and these exceptions to her customary moderation are so amusing as to be readily pardonable.

Miss Austen's favourites among her creations are endowed with the tame tastes which were her own. Her most impulsive heroine, Marianne Dashwood, is enthusiastic about Cowper, and we learn from the memoir that Cowper and Crabbe stood high

on the list of poets she admired. She never was or even fancied herself in love, so that the faithful if somewhat feeble, the delicate if slightly vague pictures of the sentiment of love—it is never passion—which we find in her novels are chiefly due to her imagination. In this sense she never "looked into her own heart, and wrote;" but she looked about her, in the spirit of amused observation, noticed how her neighbours managed their love affairs, and combined the information thus obtained, in those charming scenes, which, though not sensational or sentimental enough to attract as love stories, are full of quiet truth and power. This is especially the case in "Mansfield Park," and "Persuasion," as we shall see when considering her works in detail. "She thoroughly enjoyed Crabbe," says Mr. Austen Leigh, "perhaps on account of a certain resemblance to herself in minute and finished details; and would sometimes say, in jest, that if she ever married at all she could fancy being Mrs. Crabbe, looking on the author quite as an abstract idea, and ignorant and regardless what manner of man he might be." We can understand this, and perceive the similarity in mind, and style of workmanship; but there is no indication in Miss Austen's works that she attained to the realization of the tragic element in human life, even to the limited extent to which Crabbe attained to it.

The women whom she depicts are wonderfully various, and the good ones among them, without extraordinary elevation of character, are clever, refined, highly-principled, and interesting. Above all, they are real. The reader is made to know them personally; he cannot but see each distinctly, with an abiding perception of her appearance, and her characteristics. He could no more jumble up Miss Austen's girls in his memory, than he could mistake Minna for Brenda Troil, Julia Mannering for Di Vernon, or Rebecca for Rowena. It is in respect of her portraiture of women that Miss Austen is so superior to almost every other novelist among those who preceded her, to such of her contemporaries as are remembered, and to most subsequent writers of fiction. The heroic type would have been as much out of her line of execution as it was antipathetic to her taste; but with all Scott's domestic heroines hers may be compared to her advantage, in those respects in which any comparison is to be instituted. If we pass by the numerous novelists since Scott, and come to the novelists of this age, selecting a few of the representative ones, we shall not find any to surpass or equal her in this important regard. Thackeray, Dickens, Mrs. Gaskell, and Mr. Anthony Trollope suggest themselves at once. Miss Bronté's coarse and repulsive pictures of women, though

undeniably clever, serve only to indicate the exact opposites in taste and appreciation. A society composed of Jane Eyres, Shirleys, and Lucy Snowes would be a lamentable spectacle to gods and men; whereas a society in which such women as Emma Woodhouse, Jane Fairfax, Elinor Dashwood, Jane Bennet, and above all Anne Elliot should abound, would present a picture of pure, rational, intellectual, and actual happiness and respectability without room for an "ism" or toleration for any of those aberrations, whether of passion or conceit, which tend to make men sad and women ridiculous. Miss Austen's Fanny Price is as submissive, as simple-minded, and as jealous as Mr. Thackeray's Amelia; she is as little understood and as much snubbed, and she has an antagonist as brilliant, if less base; but she is charming, rational, and ladylike, while Amelia is silly, insipid, and underbred, though Mr. Thackeray frequently assures us of her humility and gentility. He *calls* Amelia a lady; Miss Austen *makes* Fanny Price one. Again, Mrs. Newcome is a capital picture of purse-proud patronizing vulgarity, but she is not so clever a picture as Mrs. Elton, who is indeed unsurpassed, we believe unequalled, and who is indispensable to the story of "Emma," while Mrs. Newcome is not indispensable to that of "The Newcomes." Calling her "Virtue," and keeping her dingy gloves perpetually before us, is Mr. Thackeray's method of enforcing Mrs. Newcome's self-importance and ill-breeding. Mrs. Elton is introduced in a few lines of description, never repeated or referred to, but a fresh touch is added to every sentence she speaks, and she is so real as to be positively irritating, but not positively tiresome, as Mrs. Newcome is, as Clive Newcome's mother-in-law is, as Mrs. Baynes is—(she is indeed a replica of the Old Soldier, as Charlotte Baynes is a copy of Rosy, and Philip a cheap edition of Clive),—as all Mr. Thackeray's vulgar people are. Miss Austen was too consummate an artist to produce any such effect. She can make us understand how Mr. Woodhouse wearied his clear-headed, decisive, selfish son-in-law, and how the ceaseless stream of Miss Bates's talk was too much for Emma's charity and endurance; but she makes us love Mr. Woodhouse, and we are sure nobody ever read Miss Bates's monologues once without turning to them again. Mrs. Nickleby is Miss Bates in caricature—how inferior to the original will be seen by comparing her absurd remarks to Kate about her early reminiscences, as they are sitting together in the arbour, with Miss Bates's infliction of all the details of Jane Fairfax's letter upon Emma Woodhouse, with her ramblings to pork and roast apples, or her endless eulogium of the delights and splendours

of the ball at the Crown. In this branch of her art, we regard Miss Bates as the author's masterpiece. She is highly ridiculous, but most estimable and respectable, and while the reader laughs at her, he feels for her all the friendly regard which she has long enjoyed in her native town of Highbury, and tastes with pleasure the delicate flavour of serious moral interest with which Miss Austen invests the poor, simple old maid's humble, laborious, estimable life. She adjusts this flavour so dexterously, she presents it so adroitly. In Mrs. Gaskell's last work, "Wives and Daughters," unhappily unfinished at the time of her death, there is some resemblance to Miss Austen's men and women. The canvas is larger, the manipulation is bolder, but there are shades and touches like those of the master-hand. Mrs. Gibson is just such a character as Miss Austen would have delighted in. To Mrs. Gaskell's subtle delineation she would have added her own peculiar humour. Dr. Gibson is like Mr. Bennet, in his keenness of perception, but far more estimable; he is forbearing towards the foolish, weak, tricky wife, whom he reads and despises, but in Mr. Bennet the humourist is too strong for perfect propriety. Molly Gibson understands her father's opinion of his wife perfectly, but there is no avowed confidence between them on the subject, while Mr. Bennet's daughters are divided between amusement at their father's droll way of playing upon their mother's weaknesses and their sense of his impropriety in doing so. "Cranford" is worthy of comparison with the miniature portrait of Highbury, "Emma's" home. Mrs. Gaskell's microcosmic performance has more breadth of plan and of feeling; Miss Austen's has more sharpness and superior humour.

In small touches of description, unlaboured, appropriate, as accurate in their seeming insignificance as the tiny cubes in a mosaic, Miss Austen is unsurpassed. They are to be found in every chapter, almost in every page. A cursory glance over her books will recall them in numbers. In "Mansfield Park" and "Emma" they especially abound. Who has not laughed, as much in vexation as amusement, at Mrs. Norris's scheme for bringing Fanny Price cheaply to Mansfield, and disposing of her, during the inevitable delay of a night, at "Nancy's cousin's, who is a saddler in Cheapside;" at the same lady's reluctance to allow Fanny and her brother to travel alone, because she cannot bear that the third seat in the postchaise should be unoccupied; and at the minuteness with which the fact of Frank Churchill's departure from Randall's is detailed at Highbury,—a minuteness which might

have suggested to Sheridan the famous circumstantial evidence, which ends with the postman, who had just called "with a double letter from Northamptonshire." The latter instance is remarkable for a touch of true art. It is the ostler at the "Crown" who communicates the fact that Frank Churchill has gone, and Miss Austen does not fail to remember the ostler's point of view:—

> Mr. Churchill had sent his nephew a few lines, containing, upon the whole, a tolerable account of Mrs. Churchill, and only wishing him not to delay coming back beyond the next morning early; but that Mr. Frank Churchill, having resolved to go home directly, without waiting at all, and his horse seeming to have got a cold, Tom had been sent off immediately for the "Crown" chaise, and the ostler had stood out and seen it pass by, the boy going a good pace, and driving very steady.

Again, how finely true is the account of the difficulties in the way of the dinner party at Randalls, all arising in Mr. Woodhouse's feeble fears; but when he has once accepted it as a fact that there is to be such a dinner party, and that he is to join it, he is the only person insensible to the threatening aspect of the weather. And, again, what a capital sketch of Catherine Morland's father and mother, and their unheroic qualities, we find in that delicious specimen of humorous character-painting, "Northanger Abbey:"—

> No one who had ever seen Catherine Morland in her infancy would have supposed her to be born a heroine. Her situation in life, the character of her father and mother, her own person and disposition, were all equally against her. Her father was a clergyman, without being neglected or poor, and a very respectable man, though his name was Richard, and he had never been handsome. He had a considerable independence, besides two good livings, and he was not in the least addicted to looking up his daughters. Her mother was a woman of useful, plain sense, with a good temper, and, what is more remarkable, a good constitution.

Mr. Anthony Trollope is the only modern novelist whose young ladies may be justly compared with Miss Austen's. We believe that his Lucy Robarts, Adela Gauntlet, Grace Crawley, and Lily Dale (who, in Miss Austen's hands, would have married Johnny Eames) will be felt by readers of a future generation to be as strictly true to life, as thoroughly typical girls, as Emma, Miss Dashwood, and Catherine Morland. Mr. Trollope has not so much humour, nor is that which he has so fine and incisive of its kind, as hers, but he possesses many characteristics similar to Miss Austen's, and he employs them

similarly. He works by choice within a small space; she did so of necessity, in obedience to the law of realism, which controlled her mind; and he, too, makes his best effects both serious and ludicrous by small touches. When Lucy Robarts finds fault with the pet pony because she is confused about Lord Lufton, and whips the astonished quadruped, we get as clear an insight into the state of the case as when Mrs. Bennet scolds her daughter Kitty for coughing, and Mr. Bennet remarks that Kitty *times* her coughs ill. A Miss Dunstable, of the mode of seventy years ago, would be perfectly at home in Miss Austen's pages, and Mr. Trollope might transfer Mr. Knightley to a work of his without any incongruity being detected. His John Grey of Nethercoats is very like him, duly modernized.

Amid the scarcity of local colouring in Miss Austen's works, and the monotony of such as there is, we get odd glimpses of the manners of her time, of the early hours, and the strange fashions in dress, of dinner parties at four o'clock in the afternoon, and ladies who arrayed themselves in white muslin for their walks in the depth of winter, and were called on at the supper-table for a song. The dreary fancy-work of the period also presents itself, the imitation of china, and the filigree baskets, which were not so expensive if as useless, as the leather work and the tapestry which replaced them. Her ideas of scenery are very limited. With a love of nature in the tame aspects under which she was accustomed to see it, we do not find any aspiration for a more extended knowledge, or any attempt at imaginary portraiture, such as constitutes so conspicuous a feature in Scott's works. Here, again, there is a point of resemblance between her and Thackeray, a result of the predilection for the study of human nature common to them both. There is not in all Thackeray's works to be found an indication of appreciation of the beauties of nature, there is not even consciousness of them. But he was a travelled man, whereas Miss Austen's sphere was restricted and monotonous; and yet Dickens's description of Carker's journey across France, of the storm at Yarmouth, or of Jonas Chuzzlewit's night ride to the scene of Tigg's murder, would have been as impossible to Thackeray as to Miss Austen. Mr. Anthony Trollope's style of treating the face of the earth, partly that of a sportsman, partly that of a farmer, bears some resemblance to the few allusions to the subject to be found in her works. Rosings, Sotherton, Pemberley, Barton Park, Donwell, Northanger Abbey, are all similar, all handsome, convenient, and full of modern appliances of wealth and comfort. Rosings and Pemberley she describes in almost the same words. Of the first she says,—"It was a handsome, modern building,

well situated on rising ground;" of the second,—"It was a large, handsome stone building, standing well on rising ground." Occasionally we discern a liking for architectural and historical antiquities, but it is not very pronounced. She had no taste for old books, and though Mr. Austen Leigh tells us that she was acquainted with the periodicals from the *Spectator* downwards, we have her own authority for her disapprobation of that one in particular. Among the many unobtrusive passages of acute criticism in her works, the following is especially to the purpose. It is to be found in "Northanger Abbey," follows her account of the sudden and vehement friendship between Catherine Morland and Isabella Thorpe, and its many signs and tokens, one being an agreement to read novels together, and it is interesting not only for its own sake, but as an indication of the tone of the now-forgotten reviewers of Miss Austen's day.

Yes, novels—for I will not adopt that ungenerous and impolitic custom, so common with novel-writers, of degrading, by their contemptuous censure, the very performances, to the number of which they are themselves adding, joining with their greatest enemies in bestowing the harshest epithets on such works, and scarcely ever permitting them to be read by their own heroine, who, if she accidentally take up a novel, is apt to turn over its insipid pages with disgust. Alas! if the heroine of one novel be not patronized by the heroine of another, from whom can she expect protection and regard? I cannot approve of it. Let us leave it to the reviewers to abuse such effusions of fancy at their leisure, and over every new novel to talk in threadbare strains of the trash with which the press now groans. Let us not desert one another; we are an injured body. Although our productions have afforded more extensive and unaffected pleasure than those of any other literary corporation in the world, no species of composition has been so much decried. From pride, ignorance, and fashion, our foes are almost as many as our readers, and while the abilities of the nine hundredth abridger of the "History of England," or of the man who collects and publishes in a volume some dozen lines of Milton, Pope, and Prior, with a paper from the *Spectator*, and a chapter from Sterne, are eulogized by a thousand pens, there seems almost a general wish of decrying the capacity and undervaluing the labour of the novelist, and of slighting the performances which have only genius, wit, and taste to recommend them. "I am no novel reader. I seldom look into novels. Do not imagine that *I* often read novels. It is really very well for a novel." Such is the common cant. "And what are you reading, Miss ——?" "Oh, it is only a novel!" replies the young lady, while she lays down her book with affected indifference, or momentary shame. It is perhaps only some work in which the greatest powers of the mind are displayed, in which the most thorough knowledge of human nature, the happiest delineation of its vanities, the liveliest effusions of wit and humour, are conveyed to the world in the best chosen language. Now, had the same young

lady been engaged with a volume of the *Spectator* instead of such a work, how proudly would she have produced the book and told its name, though the chances must be against her being occupied by any part of the voluminous publication, of which either the matter or manner would not disgust a young person of taste ; the substance of its papers so often consisting in the statement of improbable circumstances, unnatural characters, and topics of conversation which no longer concern any one living ; and their language, too, frequently so coarse as to give no very favourable idea of the age that could endure it."

How surprised the author of this spirited remonstrance would be, could she know the present status of the successful among novelists, the large space occupied by fiction in the world of literature, and her own high rank among its leaders. Among the fatiguing raptures, and the transcendental criticism, the wordy theories, and the general nonsense which has been written about Shakespeare, since that happy period at which the Germans claim to have made us understand him, it is refreshing to find such a gem of definition as the following, which Miss Austen lends to Henry Crawford, on the occasion of the memorable reading-party at Mansfield Park. He says :—

I don't think I have had a volume of Shakspeare in my hand since I was fifteen. I once saw Henry VIII. acted, or I have heard of it from somebody who did, I am not certain which. But Shakspeare one gets acquainted with without knowing how. It is a part of an Englishman's constitution. His thoughts and beauties are so spread abroad that one touches them everywhere ; one is intimate with him by instinct. No man of any brain can open at a good part one of his plays without falling into the flow of his meaning immediately. . . . One is familiar with Shakspeare from one's earliest years. His celebrated passages are quoted by everybody, they are in half the books we open. We all talk Shakspeare, use his similes, and describe with his description.

Cheerfulness, as marked a characteristic of Miss Austen's works as their good sense and their brilliant humour, belonged to herself also. Not only was her course of life unvaried, but her disposition was remarkably calm and even. "There was in her," says her nephew, "nothing eccentric or angular; no ruggedness of temper; no singularity of manner; none of the morbid sensibility or exaggeration of feeling which not unfrequently accompanies great talents, to be worked up into a picture. Hers was a mind well balanced on a basis of good sense, sweetened by an affectionate heart, and regulated by fixed principles; so that she was to be distinguished from many other amiable and sensible women only by that peculiar genius

which shines out clearly enough in her works, but of which a biographer can make little use." Her genius was indeed peculiar; its products are in literature what Meissonier's paintings are in art. Perfect in her own way, and on her own line, and doubly admirable because she never wandered from the one, or mistook the other, though beset with well-meant advice and what was intended for encouragement;—as, for instance, when a patronizing admirer counselled her to write an historical romance founded on the history of the House of Coburg. She was as remarkably deficient in certain qualities as she was richly endowed in others. Her pictures are entirely of the surface of life. In all her works there is not one pathetic passage. The nearest approach to pathos is her description of Fanny Price's loneliness among her grand cousins, in the strange great house. No one has ever sighed or cried over her books, and with the readiest acknowledgment of her sound sense and delicacy in handling the subject of love, it is impossible to avoid noticing the thorough worldliness of her treatment. She seems to think a woman well enough off if a man either loves her against his judgment, or marries her as a *pis aller*. We have an instance of the first in Mr. Darcy, who is quite unpardonably ungentlemanlike on the occasion of his proposal to Elizabeth Bennet; and of the second in the marriage of Edmund Bertram and Fanny Price. First, there is the fascinating stranger, Miss Crawford; then the appropriate cousin, Fanny. Colonel Brandon and Marianne Dashwood are parallel instances, reversed. Willoughby is the fascinating stranger, the Colonel the appropriate husband; in both cases the impulse of youthful feeling is permitted to exhaust itself on an unsafe object, and then, after a period of not too excruciating disappointment, the unexceptionable partner for life, with high principles, unfailing sense, cultivated tastes, and a good income, turns up, and all is well. A solid esteem for the respectable, a thorough comprehension of the blessings of a secure and prosperous position, a lady-like regard for the fitness of things, a nicely graduated sense of class rights and privileges, and an appreciation of comfort which lends an air of coziness to all her pictures of family life, these are characteristics of Miss Austen. Mr. Matthew Arnold would certainly number her among the Philistines, if complete Philistinism can exist without vulgarity. She is never doleful, not even when death is in question. Her people succeed quietly to well-to-do progenitors, whose deaths are mentioned with respectable propriety. A fever, or a "putrid" sore throat, as it was the repulsive custom of her time to call it, is the nearest approach to grave calamity made by any of her people, and the reader suffers no anxiety in

either case; nor even when Louisa Musgrove falls on her head is he alarmed. Harriet Smith, Jane Bennet, Marianne Dashwood, all have illnesses, but we do not mind them. When Tom Bertram is taken ill, we know Miss Austen will not kill off a fine young man in so prosperous a position, partly because she never does unpleasant things, and partly because she does not mean to allow Miss Crawford to become Lady Bertram. According to her, there might be nothing graver in the world than faults and vexations; she hardly glances at sins and sorrows. There are no pictures of extravagantly luxurious high life in her novels. Her one lady of rank, Lady Catherine de Bourgh, is a sample of her finest powers of sarcasm, and admirably completes the picture of Mr. Collins, without falling into caricature. But there is no low life at all, and beyond a few general allusions, such as Emma Woodhouse's visit to a poor family, there is no poverty, no wretchedness, no perception of anything below the level of middle class prosperity and decorum. She ignores the tragic side of human life altogether; she never saw it, and it did not suit the habit of her mind to pursue it in her fancy. The moral of each of her works is as unexceptionable as it is unobtrusive; but it is always a comfortable, indeed an optimist moral, and the shrewdness with which it is worked out is as remarkable as the adroitness of the sayings by which it is supported. In this particular also Miss Austen resembles Oliver Goldsmith. The pith of his admirable essay upon Gretna Green marriages may be found in a still more compressed form in her comment upon the history of Lydia Bennet and Wickham. "For my part," Goldsmith makes his Scottish landlady to say, "I am entirely for doing things in the old family way, and never loved an outlandish marriage in my life. As I have had numbers call at my house, you may be sure I was not idle in imagining who they were, and how they did in the world after they left me. I cannot say that I ever heard much good come of them; and of a history of twenty-five that I noted down in my ledger, I do not know a single couple that would not have been fully as happy if they had gone the plain way to work, and asked the consent of their parents." Miss Austen makes Elizabeth Bennet speculate upon the chances for her sister's future thus:—"How Wickham and Lydia were to be supported in tolerable independence she could not imagine; but how little of permanent happiness could belong to a couple who were only brought together because their passions were stronger than their virtue, she could easily conjecture." There is no allusion to Goldsmith in her novels; his name has no place in the list of those writers whom she was known to admire, but

many traits of resemblance between them have impressed us, and her works may be read over and over again, in spite of familiarity with them, with no more risk of provoking weariness or breeding contempt, than could come of any number of perusals of "The Vicar of Wakefield." They are not equal to that immortal story, whose tenderness, simple devotion, and pathos, are out of Miss Austen's reach, and beside her aim; as impossible to her as the charming incongruities, the blunders in construction, which we could not so ill have spared, are foreign to her calm, accurate perfection, and her deliberate touch, never hasty even when most brilliant. But Miss Austen might have drawn the Vicar's wife and daughters, and written the famous conversation, at which Mr. Burchell assisted in the capacity of chorus. "I chose my wife as she did her wedding-gown, not for a firm, glossy surface, but such qualities as would wear well," is quite in her style, and the Morland family picture is a reproduction of the Vicar's summary of his children's dispositions. "In a word, a family likeness prevailed through all, and, properly speaking, they had but one character, that of being all equally generous, credulous, simple, and inoffensive." Goldsmith might have written the following:—"Mrs. Allen was one of that numerous class of females whose society can raise no other emotion than surprise at there being any man in the world who could like them well enough to marry them. She had neither beauty, genius, accomplishment, nor manner. The air of a gentlewoman, a great deal of quiet, inactive, good temper, and a trifling turn of mind, were all that could account for her being the choice of a sensible, intelligent man like Mr. Allen." Miss Austen might have written the last sentences of the Vicar's story,—in fact, she did more than once write something very like it. "I had nothing now on this side of the grave to wish for," says Dr. Primrose; "all my cares were over, my pleasures were unspeakable. It now only remained that my gratitude in good fortune should exceed my former submission in adversity."

Nothing is more remarkable than the similarity in design and structure of Miss Austen's novels, considered in combination with their extraordinary variety of character. It is only on examining them with an express purpose that the reader discovers how much sameness of incident there is, how entirely and justly the author trusted in her power of flavouring her piquant dishes, how indifferent she was to the monotony of their material.

"Pride and Prejudice" was the first, "Sense and Sensibility" the second of the six novels, of which "Northanger Abbey" and "Persuasion" were not published until after the

writer's death. In both, the interest centres in two sisters who have a silly mother. In both there are two lovers,—one weak and fickle; the other strong, sensible, and constant. The Miss Bennets and the Miss Dashwoods are as distinct as they are admirable. On the whole, Jane Bennet is the most refined and elevated of Miss Austen's creations, and Elizabeth the most original, amusing, and charming, though she has been said, with some justice, to be pert. Mr. Bingley, Mr. Darcy, and Mr. Wickham in the first story, play corresponding parts to those of Edward Ferrars, Colonel Brandon, and Willoughby in the second. Wickham is favoured by Lizzy Bennet, who slights Darcy; but Darcy exposes his real character, and reveals in confidence to Lizzy that he has attempted to induce his sister, Miss Darcy, to elope with him. Colonel Brandon is slighted by Marianne Dashwood, while the unprincipled and inconstant Willoughby is favoured; but Colonel Brandon exposes Willoughby's real character, revealing to Marianne's sister the fact that he is the seducer of the Colonel's niece. Mrs. Hurst, and her sister, Miss Bingley, in "Pride and Prejudice," are the equivalents of the Misses Steele in "Sense and Sensibility," toadyism, flattery, and discomfiture included, but there is not the smallest resemblance between them; indeed, they are strongly contrasted, the refined insolence of the two former being as perfectly represented as the irritating yet amusing vulgarity of the two latter. Nancy Steele is surpassed only by Mrs. Norris. In both stories the wealthy lover, at first slighted, ultimately accepted, is the *deus ex machinâ* who settles family troubles, and makes everything comfortable. Barton Park, the great house at which the Miss Dashwoods are constantly expected to dine, is the counterpart of Rosings; and Lady Catherine, the insolent aunt of Mr. Darcy, is balanced by Mrs. Ferrars, the insolent mother of Elinor Dashwood's lover. They interfere respectively, and with personal impertinence, to prevent the marriage of the two couples, and each precipitates the event. Even the asserted engagement of Mr. Darcy to his cousin, Miss de Bourgh, has its parallel in Mrs. Ferrars's determination that her son shall marry Miss Morton; and John Dashwood, the son-in-law and flatterer of Mrs. Ferrars, is almost as solemn a fool as Mr. Collins, and is, like him with regard to the Bennets, first bent upon making up to the Dashwood girls for his inheritance of fortune at their expense, and then persuaded out of his intention by a mean, mercenary, domineering wife. Mrs. Collins, with her calm, reasonable self-interest, and her candid avowal of her motive in marrying the pompous servile ass who is heir of entail to Mr. Bennet, is a superior creature to Mrs. John

Dashwood; but Mrs. John Dashwood is the more natural of the two. In both these novels there is an unnecessary sister, Mary Bennet and Margaret Dashwood, and an unseen evil-working woman, whose story is told to the personages concerned, that story being in each case almost identical. In both there is an invaluable female friend, to whom the two sisters go on visits, whose incidents decide their future fate; but here again the similarity is less remarkable than the difference. Marianne Dashwood is not less unlike Jane Bennet than Mrs. Jennings is unlike Mrs. Gardiner. The elopement of Lydia Bennet with Wickham, without his having any intention of marrying her, an improbable incident, considering their position in life, is an imaginative effort of the author's in order to pile up the obstacles to Elizabeth's marriage with Darcy, which reminds us of Lady Anne Lindsay's dilemma, when she wanted one more misfortune for "Auld Robin Gray," and her sister suggested, "steal the cow," upon which "the cow was stol'n awa'." But this unlikely incident is treated with admirable consistency, and the levity of Mrs. Bennet and her younger daughters is the lively and amusing study, from which the delicate and perfect delineation of Miss Crawford's warped sense of propriety and deficiency of moral tone is afterwards executed. Miss Crawford, in "Mansfield Park," is one of the most brilliant of Miss Austen's productions. If not so entertaining as Lizzy Bennet, she is as witty, and more refined.

"Mansfield Park" gives us the incomparable Mrs. Norris, and Lady Bertram: the latter is a triumph of art, for she is a model of sleek, indolent, contented selfishness; and yet who could possibly dislike Lady Bertram, or blame Fanny Price for loving the aunt who is as systematically as she is unconsciously inconsiderate of her? The two women are made to express themselves with consummate skill, which never flags throughout the book. Edmund Bertram discovers, one evening, that his Cousin Fanny has a head-ache, and being far from suspecting that love for himself, and jealousy of Miss Crawford, have anything to do with it, investigates the cause:—

"Did you go out in the heat, Fanny?"

"Go out! To be sure she did," said Mrs. Norris: "would you have her stay within such a fine day as this? Were we not *all* out? Even your mother was out to-day for above an hour."

"Yes, indeed, Edmund," said her ladyship, "I was out above an hour. I sat three quarters of an hour in the flower garden, while Fanny cut the roses; and very pleasant it was, I assure you, but very hot. It was shady enough in the alcove; but I declare I quite dreaded the coming home again."

"Fanny has been cutting roses, has she?"

"Yes, and I am afraid they will be the last this year. Poor thing! *She* found it hot enough; but they were so full blown that one could not wait."

"There was no help for it, certainly," rejoined Mrs. Norris: "but I question whether her headache might not be caught then. Suppose you let her have your aromatic vinegar; I always forget to have mine filled."

"She has got it," said Lady Bertram; "she has had it ever since she came back from your house the second time."

"What!" cried Edmund; has she been walking as well as cutting roses; walking across the hot park to your house, and doing it twice, Ma'am? No wonder her——"

"I was afraid it would be too much for her," said Lady Bertram; "but when the roses were gathered, your aunt wished to have them, and then you know they must be taken home."

"But were there enough to oblige her to go twice?"

"No, but they were to be put into the spare room to-day; and, unluckily, Fanny forgot to lock the door of the room, and bring away the key: so she was obliged to go again."

Edmund got up and walked about the room, saying: "And could nobody be employed on such an errand but Fanny? Upon my word, Ma'am, it has been a very ill-managed business."

"I'm sure I don't know how it was to have been done better;" cried Mrs. Norris, unable to be longer deaf, "unless I had gone myself, indeed; but I cannot be in two places at once; and I was talking to Mr. Green at that very time about your mother's dairymaid, by *her* desire; and had promised John Groom to write to Mrs. Jefferies about his son, and the poor fellow was waiting for me half an hour. I think nobody can justly accuse me of sparing myself on any occasion; but, really, I cannot do everything at once. And as to Fanny's just stepping down to my house for me,—it is not much above a quarter of a mile,—I cannot think I was unreasonable to ask it. How often do I pass it, early and late—three times a day, and in all weathers too. . . . Between ourselves, Edmund," nodding significantly at his mother, "it was cutting the roses, and dawdling about in the flower garden, that did the mischief."

"I am afraid it was," said the more candid Lady Bertram, who overheard her; "I am very much afraid she caught the headache there, for the heat was enough to kill anybody. It was as much as I could bear, myself;—sitting, and calling to Pug, and trying to keep him from the flower-beds was almost too much for me."

Mrs. Norris must be allowed to take precedence of all Miss Austen's serio-comic creations. Several come near—none equal her. The transaction of the green baize curtain for the theatre at Mansfield; the economy with which she cuts it out; the "delighted integrity" with which she effects a saving of half-a-crown to the absent Sir Thomas, while abetting proceedings of which he must heartily disapprove; the skill with which she parries his reproof; and the ultimate triumph with which she carries off the curtain to her own house, "where

she happened to be particularly in want of green baize," would alone render her incomparable. Her vicarious charity, her indomitable management, her toadying, her grasping covetousness, her spitefulness to Fanny,—extending from grudging her a fire in her room at Lady Bertram's expense, and her share in a country excursion, to being angry because she is sought by a man whom she will not marry;—her prying into the housekeeping of her successors at the Vicarage; and her successful raid upon the poultry and dairy produce of Sotherton, are all wonderfully effective strokes of description.

Miss Austen was very fond of her brothers, who were in the Navy, and very proud of them, feelings to which are due some of the happiest touches in "Mansfield Park," relating to the midshipman's visit to his sister; and, in particular, the pretty incident of Fanny's only ornament, the amber cross her brother brings home from one of his voyages. Mr. Austen Leigh's Memoir gives but few specimens of his aunt's letters; in one of them, to her sister, there is this passage: "Charles has received £30 for his share of the privateer, and expects £10 more; but of what avail is it to take prizes if he lays out the produce in presents to his sisters? He has been buying gold chains and topaz crosses for us. He must be well scolded. . . . I will write by this post to thank and reproach him. . . . We shall be unbearably fine."

In "Emma" the characters are admirably drawn, with the exception of Frank Churchill, who is a rather worthless young man, and who furnishes one of the few instances in which vagueness can be laid to the author's charge. We cannot help thinking she drew Frank Churchill purposely to justify Mr. Knightley's small opinion of him. There is a little clumsiness about the story, but its richness in humour is wonderful. Miss Austen says of it, "I am strongly haunted with the idea that to those readers who have preferred 'Pride and Prejudice,' it will appear inferior in wit, and to those who have preferred 'Mansfield Park,' inferior in good sense." This idea was unfounded. Mr. Austen Leigh tells us that she was very fond of Emma, but did not reckon upon her being a general favourite, for when commencing that work she said, "I am going to take a heroine whom no one but myself will much like." In this she was right to a certain extent, for there is a good deal of unamiability underlying Emma's brilliancy and charm, but the fine rebuke administered by Mr. Knightley to her unfeeling wit at poor Miss Bates's expense, witnesses to the author's perception of that unamiability, and gains additional interest from her nephew's testimony concerning her unexceptionable employment of her own remarkable humour and

power of sarcasm. "She was as far as possible from being censorious or satirical." In a short memoir, from whose hand does not appear, prefixed to an edition of her works published in 1832, we find the following remarks upon the same point: "If there be an opinion current in the world that a perfectly amiable temper is not reconcilable to a lively imagination and a keen relish for wit, such an opinion will be rejected for ever by those who had the happiness of knowing Miss Austen. Though the frailties, foibles, and follies of others could not escape her immediate detection, yet even on these vices did she never trust herself to comment with unkindness. . . . She never uttered a hasty, a silly, or a severe expression. In short, her temper was as polished as her wit."

The "Quarterly Review," in 1821, contained an article on Miss Austen's works, written by Dr. Whateley, in which he did justice to the humour, wisdom, and variety of her fools, claiming them as special evidences of the writer's ability, and remarking that she resembled Shakspeare in her admirable discrimination in the character of fools. Some of the most excellent are to be found among Emma's friends. Mr. Woodhouse is superlative, so is Miss Bates, and we suspect Miss Austen of having intended to include in the number Emma's sister, with her prejudice against everybody's doctor but her own, and her difficulty in making her cook understand what she means by "a nice smooth basin of gruel,—thin, but not *too* thin." Her wits are delightful, but we incline to prefer her fools, like Goldsmith's, and the combination of fool and wit, in Mrs. Palmer's case, is one of her finest achievements. Even where she does not care to elaborate a fool, but merely gives us a half length or a profile, how delightful it is. Mary Bennet does not occupy a page, Kitty does not occupy two, but could we part with them? Any rational friend might as well as Mrs. Allen have taken Catherine Morland to Bath, in order that she might meet Mr. Tilney, but what a difference it would have made to us. What a loss it would have been if Maria Rushworth had married a sensible man for his wealth and position, instead of the ponderous donkey, whose satin cloak and forty-two speeches share with Mrs. Norris and the baize curtain, the honours of the private theatricals at Mansfield Park. Of Miss Austen's minor fools we could endure to part with only one. Sir William Lucas might be eliminated with advantage. The book which boasts fools of such distinction as Mr. Collins and Mrs. Bennet, does not need the bowing and complimenting knight.

"Those who know anything of composition," says Oliver Goldsmith, "are sensible that, in pursuing humour, it will sometimes lead us into the recesses of the mean." Miss Austen

was so led as regards the characters she most humorously depicted. There is little wickedness in her novels, but there is a great deal of meanness. Even in her latest work, "Persuasion," which has dignity, tenderness, and sweetness far beyond any of the preceding five novels, meanness abounds. Sir Walter Elliot, who is a male Lady Catherine, but far more humorously drawn, is essentially mean; so is his handsome daughter Elizabeth, while her toady, Mrs. Clay, is one of the most real toadies ever put in a book, and this implies that she is one of the meanest. The Ferrars family, with the exception of Edward; Nancy and Lucy Steele; John Thorpe and his sister; the vulgar, pompous General Tilney; John Dashwood, Mr. Collins and Maria Lucas, Miss Bingley, Miss Gray, Mrs. Norris, Lady Catherine, Mrs. Musgrove, and Mr. and Mrs. Elton,—there is no monotony in these creations, but they are all animated by mean motives, inspired by petty feelings, and as contemptible as they are inexhaustibly amusing.

All Miss Austen's novels end happily, and in a similar way. She, like every other novelist, doubtless found it difficult to bring about the betrothal of the fit and proper persons without importing into her pages any of the embarrassment and silliness which accompany such incidents in real life. It is not extraordinary that she surmounted the difficulty, but it is remarkable that she disposed of it in four distinguished instances by similar means, and three of those instances have strong points of resemblance in their accessories. Mr. Knightley takes a walk with Emma, and proposes to her, her father being entirely unsuspicious of their mutual feelings, and they experience a delightful conscious embarrassment in the ignorant family circle during the evening. Mr. Darcy calls at Longbourn, and takes Elizabeth out for a walk, during which he proposes to her. Her parents are entirely unsuspicious of their mutual feelings, and they too enjoy their charming mystery until after supper. Mr. Tilney takes Eleanor Morland out for a walk, and proposes to her, and her parents are also profoundly unconscious. Captain Wentworth and Anne Elliot also make up their eight years' estrangement out of doors, and nobody has the least notion of what they are about. It is no trifling evidence of Miss Austen's confidence in her skill that she did not think it necessary to vary the form of her narratives, and that this sameness does not in the least militate against the interest, and the entertainment of her readers, is a proof that her confidence was just. We find in "Persuasion" another instance of her indifference to variety of incident. Two accidents happen in the course of the story,—one to prevent the hero and heroine meeting on a particular occasion; the other,

to bring them together under agitating circumstances. Miss Austen makes these accidents identical in their nature. Little Charles Musgrove has a bad fall in the first instance, and his aunt Louisa has a worse in the second.

From Mrs. Gaskell's daughters the public learned something of what the fate of her "Wives and Daughters" was to have been. The author's pleasant custom was to talk about her brain-friends in the family circle, and a few charming hints about Cynthia and Molly and Mrs. Gibson were forthcoming. "Miss Austen would, if asked," says Mr. Leigh, "tell us many little particulars about the subsequent career of some of her people. In this traditionary way we learned that Miss Steele never succeeded in catching the Doctor; that Kitty Bennet was married to a clergyman near Pemberley, while Mary obtained nothing higher than one of her uncle Philip's clerks, and was content to be considered a star in the society of Meyton; that the 'considerable sum' given by Mrs. Morris to William Price was one pound, and that the letters placed by Frank Churchill before Jane Fairfax, which she swept away unread, contained the word 'pardon.' Of the good people in 'Northanger Abbey' and 'Persuasion' we know nothing more than what is written; for before those works were published their author had been taken away from us, and all such amusing communications had ceased for ever."

The landed gentry, the Church, and the Navy furnish Miss Austen with the greater number of her leading male personages. Her intellectual sympathies, her personal tastes, as revealed in her works, lean decidedly towards the latter. Captain Wentworth, in "Persuasion," is incomparably her most interesting lover, and Admiral Croft one of the most original, worthy, harmonious, and loveable of her characters. There is no meanness about him and his wife, they are as respectable as they are entertaining. William Price rivals Mr. Crawford in interest, in life, in spirit, and in importance. She does indeed hint at an ill-conducted Admiral, but she never brings him on the scene; and Captain Wentworth's brother officers, who make but brief appearances, are charming. Among the men of fortune who marry her favoured heroines after the slight and admirably tempered winds of adversity to which she subjects them, Mr. Knightley, Mr. Darcy, and Mr. Bingley are unexceptionable; but Mr. Knightley, being free from the pride and the slight touch of pedantry of the one, and the amiable readiness to be dictated to of the other, is as much their superior as Miss Austen wishid and believed him to be. Colonel Brandon is vague, and, it must be confessed, unattractive.

In Miss Austen's clerical portraits, we find food for grave

reflection. Her works bespeak, and her biographer demands for her, credit for accuracy as unerring as it is conscientious, in the delineation of every phase of society and character which she undertakes to illustrate. She wrote of nothing which she had not seen; she wrote of everything as she saw it. She was the sister of two naval officers,—we know how she depicted the characters formed in and by that profession, and the estimate entertained by its members of its rank, duties, privileges, and honour. She was a clergyman's daughter, and it is reasonable to conclude that she depicted clerical life as it appeared to her, and that in reproducing the general estimate and expectation respecting clerical duties, she represented it with her customary accuracy. In her six novels we find seven clergymen, of whom three play leading parts in the several stories, and the fourth has a brief pleasing love episode in "Persuasion."

Miss Austen did not live in the detestable era of Fleet parsons, or in the yet earlier one so admirably described by Macaulay, in a sketch to which we are probably indebted for the edifying Mr. Sampson of the "Virginians," when the chaplain left the table as soon as the pudding was placed upon it, and was expected to marry my lady's waiting-woman, or to form a still more degrading connection for my lord's convenience. But she did live in a period of indifferentism as difficult for Catholics to comprehend, and more sad to their contemplation, than the present, with its buzz of dispute, revolt from every kind of authority, and manifold theorizing. In her pages we do not find Dr. Tusher, but we do find Dr. Grant, who seems to us of the two the more lamentable picture, because there is some reprobation as well as ridicule attached by Mr. Thackeray to the complacent husband of Beatrix Esmond; whereas when Miss Austen objects to Dr. Grant's characteristics, it is not at all from the point of view in which they give *us* scandal. In our time, the world says: "Hang dogma! What do you want with dogma? Let religion be a matter of opinion like free trade, the origin of species, the German frontiers, or anything else you like." But religion is discussed; people have or form opinions about it; it is a force, a principle, a living thing in our midst. Seventy years ago, when Miss Austen began to execute her photographic views of society, people, that is to say, "genteel" people, did not trouble themselves about it at all. There were odd proceedings going on among the Methodist bodies, and the process was in operation whose progress caused a French wit to describe England "as a country in which there were four hundred religions and only one sauce." But among the tranquil well-bred upper and middle classes, who appertained to the State creed, indifferentism,

blank and comfortable, prevailed. The Church of England, according to them, has an institution, like Parliament, or the Justices of the Peace, less important than the one, and less useful than the others. The clergy of this church were younger sons, brought up to fill its places of preferment,—a vocation, to be sure, after its kind; but as far, in a spiritual sense, as any of the preceding abominations of the Tusher and Sampson kind from the true meaning of a vocation to the Ministry of the Church of Jesus Christ. In Miss Austen's novels this estimate of the position of clergymen is clearly defined. There is not the slightest trace of spirituality to be found throughout them. They do not contain a line with which the most enlightened conscience would need to reproach itself, but a system purely human in its morality might form precisely the order of mind which reproduces itself there. Mr. Austen Leigh assures us that his aunt's piety was deep and active, and we accept the assurance gladly; but there is nothing to indicate it in her works, and his own language on the subject reveals a habit of mind which is strange to our Catholic modes of thought and speech. "I do not venture to speak of her religious principles," says her biographer, himself a clergyman, "that is a subject on which she herself was more inclined to *think* and *act*, than to talk, and I shall imitate her reserve; satisfied to have shown how much of Christain love and humility abounded in her heart, without presuming to lay bare the roots whence those graces grew." Religious novels are detestable things, and there is no more nauseous reading, even from the merely critical point of view, than the gushing platitudes and offensive familiarities of the "memoirs" and "remains" of "eminent Christians,"—a species of literature which, we are glad to observe, has gone out of fashion of late. But in the case of so true and finished an artist as Miss Austen, and when we are specially invited by her biographer to trace the indications of her mind and disposition to be found in her works in their completeness, it is natural to perceive and comment upon the absence of an attribute specially claimed for her, and which we are accustomed to think must insensibly influence thought and colour its expression, however restricted from ostentatious or intentional display. In the absence of any trace of her own religious opinions or feelings, we are next led to examine her delineation of the society in which she lived, in order to discover what share or influence in it she allows to religion and its ministers. Here we find ourselves anticipated by her biographer, who insists upon the accuracy of her portraiture of the clergy, admitting that not one of her clerical heroes "had adequate ideas of the duties of a parish minister." "Such,

however," says Mr. Leigh, "were the opinions and practice then prevalent among respectable and conscientious clergymen before their minds had been stirred, first by the Evangelical, and afterwards by the High Church movement which this century has witnessed. The country may be congratulated, which, on looking back to such a fixed landmark, can find that it has been advancing instead of receding from it."

It seems wonderful to us that a member of the clerical body of the Church of England,—a church which declares itself to be apostolic,—can take such a view of such an epoch in its history. That in the eighteenth century of its existence, it should have had "a fixed landmark" of such a nature as "the opinions and practice of respectable and conscientious clergymen," according to the types presented by Miss Austen—appears to us an utterly unanswerable argument against its truth, authority, and apostolic origin. No individual misconduct of its ministers, no interior scandals could furnish one so effective; for they may, and do, as we Catholics know too well, exist, without dimming for a moment the lustre of the central truth and unity; but here is an epoch of opinion and practice among the constituent members of the clerical body, in which spirituality has absolutely no place, and it would have been simply regarded as fanatical, absurd, and superstitious to associate the idea of a supernatural mission with the "duty" of a clergyman, or to regard him as in any respect different from a lawyer or a doctor, except in the fortunate accident of the superiority accorded by custom to his social status. Catholics have no difficulty in understanding the fact, and tracing its origin, common to all the irrationalities and eccentricities of the Protestant aberration; but that Protestants, Church of England people themselves, should not perceive the absurdity of such a position, but should gravely comment upon it as an accident, as something unconnected with their vital condition, is to us inexplicable. Until this "landmark" and the landmark affixed by the Apostles can be proved to be identical, we cannot see how the Church of England is to be identified with the Church founded by them on any system of reasonable deduction.

We know Miss Austen to have been a woman of high principles and refined mind, and we conclude she was not prejudiced against the profession to which her father belonged, and which she assigns to three of her favourite heroes. Whence comes it then that she did not regard that profession with too much respect to make Mr. Elton, Mr. Collins, and Dr. Grant members of it? Henry Tilney, Edward Ferrars, and Edmund Bertrand are merely agreeable, fashionable young men, the latter, who is the best of the three, reaches in his manner and

discourse only a decorous, formal seriousness, *tried on* in the introductory portions of the story, and to be *put on* with the irrevocable black coat. With the other two it is impossible to associate an idea of the clerical calling at all. The fourth young clergyman, Charles Hayter, is unaffectedly interested in his profession solely that he may marry; and Mr. Tilney's occasional residence at his living, when his curate's engagements elsewhere make it necessary, is alleviated by the improvement of his grounds, and the care of his shrubbery. Miss Austen makes the men whom her heroines are destined to marry, clergymen, because it is easy, respectable, probable, and ready to hand in her own experience; but there is no devotion, no piety about them, no recognition that any such thing could be required or expected. Henry Tilney is in his proper place in a country dance, and we like his sprightliness; Edmund Bertram is in his place in a handsome country mansion, making himself agreeable to a pretty and clever girl, whose mockery of the clerical life is piquant and effective. But can we imagine either preaching to sinners, teaching men and women the things which belong unto peace, ministering to the sick, supporting the dying, working among the poor? Assuredly not. They are in the world, and of it, well-looking, well-dressed, well-mannered, the friends of Dives, and with Lazarus have they no concern. It may be said that we are not called upon for any such effort of the imagination; that we need not think of them in any but the circumstances in which they appear. But why should there be no incongruity in pursuing the other creations of Miss Austen's pen through any imaginary phases of their life, and finding each in harmony with his position and his duties? Why should the realism which never fails elsewhere, fail here? The answer is not far to seek.

When we examine the three remaining clerical portraits, we find that they represent the three least estimable individuals in Miss Austen's books. Dr. Grant is a sensual, selfish *bon vivant*, whose wife keeps him in good humour by taking care that he has a good dinner every day; and whose sister-in-law ridicules him, among a large circle of his parishioners, for being put out of that condition of temper by an unfortunate error about partridges.

Dr. and Mrs. Grant, and their household, contrast most unfavourably with Admiral and Mrs. Croft, and theirs. Mr. Elton is a mean, ungentlemanly, presumptuous person, a fortune hunter and a sycophant, who assists his wife to insult a dependent girl, and is devoted only to dining out. It is also noticeable that Mr. Elton is the only case in which Miss Austen refers to the after-dinner drinking prevalent in her time. Mr.

Collins is a sycophant of a far lower type than Mr. Elton, a braggart, and a solemn fool. As before said, he is one of the author's two caricatures; and she mates him with a wife whose cool self-interest is her chief characteristic. Such are Miss Austen's clerical portraits, and we accept them, the good and the bad, as accurate types, with her biographer's confirmation.

We learn from Mr. Austen Leigh, on the authority of Lady Trevelyan, that Lord Macaulay had intended to write a memoir of Miss Austen, with criticisms on her works, to prefix it to a new edition of her works, and from the proceeds of the sale to erect a monument to her memory in Winchester Cathedral. "That portion of the plan," says Mr. Leigh, "in which Lord Macaulay's success would have been most certain, might have been almost sufficient for his object. A memoir written by him would have been a monument." This is well said; but, though Lord Macaulay's criticism of those marvellous novels would have secured their higher appreciation, and enhanced her fame, a memoir, even by him, could not have possessed the value and the simple, truthful charm of this one, written by a relative who knew, loved, and remembers her,—one who enables us to feel respect and affection for Jane Austen, the woman, in at least equal proportion to the admiration her works inspire for Jane Austen the novelist.

Art. VII.—THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

The Visible Unity of the Catholic Church maintained against opposite theories, with an Explanation of certain Passages in Ecclesiastical History erroneously appealed to in their support. By M. J. Rhodes, M.A. In two vols. Longman, 1870.

ON the first appearance of this valuable book we gave some account of it in a short notice at the end of our April number. But what it discusses is so distinctly the controversy of the day, that we should fail in our duty if we did not treat the subject more at length.

There are few changes in the language and opinions of our day which are more striking to those who can remember the England of forty years back, than the general admission by thoughtful Anglicans of the fact that the Church of God is by Divine appointment one visible body, and that the existence of separated sects is, in itself, a violation of the Divinely appointed order. Forty

years ago, the general opinion among Anglicans was that the existence of various sects was on the whole good—that it prevented any from sinking into carelessness and indifference—that there was substantial unity among sects, so long as they agreed upon fundamentals, and agreed to differ upon things of minor importance. They further held that all the main Protestant sects actually did thus agree—that the only thing to be regretted was that many of their members, instead of seeing and admitting this real union, had quarrelled among themselves; and that all that was now needed for the restoration of union was, that men should cultivate a more Christian spirit, and regard each other with mutual toleration and forbearance.

This may be called the purely Protestant theory. Those indeed who maintained it were far enough from disclaiming the name. They excluded from the imaginary "Church" which they had devised out of all whom they called "Evangelical Protestants," two classes of men who called themselves Christians,—Catholics (whom they called Papists) and Socinians; for both of these, they declared, denied the fundamental doctrines, in holding which the unity of the Church consisted.

This theory is more broadly and nakedly put forward by the late Dr. Chalmers in his "Lectures on Church Establishments" than in any other book known to us. Dr. Chalmers, we perhaps need hardly say, was for many years the leader and chief of the Presbyterian establishment in Scotland. In his later years he was involved in the dispute about the right claimed by Scotch congregations to reject the ministers appointed to benefices by patrons, and in the spring of the year 1843, when this question had been decided against the claimants by the supreme authority of the law, he seceded from the establishment, followed by nearly half its ministers, and founded the existing "Free Kirk of Scotland." In the year 1838, a few years before that controversy arose, he was engaged by some zealous Anglicans, anxious for the best possible defence against the numerous assaults which were just then made upon the Anglican Establishment, to deliver in London a series of lectures on the "Establishment and Extension of National Churches." The principles he laid down were, that it is the duty of a Christian government to establish, by law, some one form of Christianity—that this was first done by Constantine the Great. "The first example of a government having made selection of a faith to be signalized and supported as a national religion, is that of Constantine, who evinced all the greater strength of motive and determination in doing so, that, in setting up this new establishment, he superseded or overthrew an old one . . . The second example of anything similar to this in history took place at the Reformation, when a change was accomplished in the national establish-

ments of several countries in Europe—not a change, as before, from Paganism to Christianity, but a change from Popery to Protestantism, or from one denomination of Christianity to another." Then discussing the existing demand for the overthrow of the Church of England, he said he should not in that case fear for "our Protestantism," for "the question between Protestantism and Popery was not a question which could only be resolved in an assembly of priests or of scholastics; but a question that might be rightly entertained and rightly decided also in any assembly of well-educated Englishmen. We could not imagine a more testing evidence of an incompetent and vulgarized Parliament, than that it should not be qualified to decide between the merits of Protestantism and Popery—or which of the two systems, not in respect of policy, but in respect of absolute truth and of sacred obligation, is most worthy of being upholden as the national faith of these realms. In this nation, of all others, there is none, with the ordinary schooling of a gentleman, who could not thoroughly inform himself, and by the reading of a few weeks, on this great question; we need only a parliament of England's best principled and best educated men." Then he went on to rail at Irish Catholics, and to protest (for it would be an abuse of language to call what he said an argument) against the abolition of the Irish Protestant establishment, declaring that if it were even proposed "not perhaps to abolish but at least to abridge the legal funds for the support of Protestantism" in Ireland, there would be "enough not of fiery zeal, but of calm, resolute, and withal enlightened principle in the land to resent the outrage—to meet and overbear it." He exclaimed against the notion that the established clergy in Ireland were to attend only to the Protestants. On the contrary, the establishment ought to be "a great home mission, with its ministers acting the part of devoted missionaries;" and instead of this, he complained that the best Protestant clergymen in Ireland had "avowed an honest though still a grievously mistaken principle, that they went beyond their legitimate province if they meddled at all with the Catholic population; at which rate the primitive Christians went beyond their legitimate province when they meddled with the Pagans of the Roman empire." Next, Dr. Chalmers went on to say, that easy as it is to choose between Protestantism and Popery, it is not so easy "to select and single out from among the numerous sectarian varieties of evangelical Protestantism, that one denomination which is most entitled to the privileges and honours of an establishment. For, substantially speaking, they have all one and the same theology, and we may say that, experimentally speaking, they have all made their contributions to the sound education of the people in the habits and principles of Christianity." Then he

praised in detail the different Protestant sects (except the Socinians) and said, Why not endow and establish them? Because, he replies, it would be too expensive. "It was on theological principles that we stripped popery of her endowments. It is on the principles of a right fiscal, or a right economical arrangement, that, while recognizing the substantial unity of two, three, or more of the Protestant bodies, we endow but one of them and leave out the rest." They differ merely on "the non-essentials of Christianity —the *nugæ triviales,* if not the *nugæ difficiles* of doctrine and government—the caprices or whimsical peculiarities, in which, through the very wantonness of freedom in this land of perfect toleration, men have chosen to besport themselves, and so have broken forth into their parti-coloured varieties; each having a creed, or, rather I would say, each having a costume and a designation of their own; for, substantially, nine-tenths of the people in Britain have all the same creed." In conclusion, referring to the Oxford tracts, which had then been coming out for some five years, and which maintained the exclusive claims of the Anglican communion on the ground of apostolical succession, equally against "Romanism and popular Protestantism," he said, "When once the Church of England shall have come down from all that is transcendental or mysterious in her pretensions, and, quitting the plea of her exclusive apostolical derivation, shall rest more upon that wherein the real greatness of her strength lies, 'her rights as as an establishment,' she will be recognized as the great standard and rallying-post for all those who would unite in this mighty cause."

Such are the grounds on which the great mass of the Anglican clergy and laity rested the claims of their communion thirty years ago. Let it not be thought that we have done them any injustice in selecting as their mouthpiece a leading Presbyterian, for the selection was their own. Indeed, nothing could more strikingly illustrate the state of feeling among religious Anglicans at that time, than the fact that zealous men, anxious to support the Church of England against all assailants, should have selected such a man for their champion. And when his lectures were published, they were received with almost universal applause. The "British Critic," at that time under the direction of J. H. Newman, protested—that was a matter of course; but we believe that no other voice was raised in the Church of England against the assumption, that its real strength was to be found in the principles proclaimed, by Dr. Chalmers, and that he was its best defender.

Observe then upon what grounds Anglicanism was defended in those days. Popery, it was said, is evidently and indisputably false. Socinianism is the denial of Christianity. All other Pro-

testant sects have the same theology, the same religion,—they are actually one. Let them combine and act as one.

We need hardly say how great the change among English Protestants has already been. Even among Protestant dissenters it is probably greater than is generally known, because their social position and education bring them less prominently before the world. We believe, however, that even among them, the most educated and most religious party would now speak, or at least would feel quite differently from Dr. Chalmers about "Popery." They are in general quite as ready as Catholics themselves to maintain that if our Blessed Lord gave authority to any one Church, and promised His Divine Presence to it in any exclusive sense, then the churches in communion with Pius IX., and those only, must be that Church. They maintain this obvious truth in controversy against Anglicans, and assuming the premise that the Roman Catholic Church is not the only true Church, deduce from it, very logically, the conclusion that no such Church exists, and therefore that the Anglican communion can have no claims to be such a Church. And indeed one does not see how, without abandoning their fundamental characteristics, they can well adopt any theory of unity other than that which makes it consist in mutual agreement of divided sects to differ upon non-essentials, without quarrelling with each other. Still men possess so wonderful a power of inventing theories adapted to their position, that we should by no means feel surprised if, before very long, the more religious dissenters should come forward with some such theory, abandoning Dr. Chalmers's notion of unity, and professing to show that their position is not really inconsistent with the unity of the Church as it has been held in every age before Protestantism was heard of. When they produce such a theory (which we heartily hope they may, because it would imply their having taken at least one considerable stride towards the one truth), it will be time enough to combat it. Meanwhile we may predict with confidence that if it is ever produced, it will really and substantially be the same as that which they have hitherto maintained; namely, that Christian unity is not external and visible, but invisible and "spiritual," and that it consists in mutual charity and goodwill between the members of sects which still continue separate. For in truth there is no alternative. Religious bodies cannot really be at one and the same time, and in the same sense of the words, both united and disunited; and all arguments to prove that any two of them can at the same time be visibly one, and yet visibly divided, is a shock to the common sense of mankind.

And this really is the case with the arguments by which Anglicans try to prove that Catholics, Greek schismatics, and they

themselves are really one Church. The great step which has been gained since 1838 is that now the mass of them, abandoning Dr. Chalmers's theory, maintain this new position. And what has already moved the great mass of the Anglican clergy and educated laity so far as this in the direction of truth is, in fact, the controversy with Catholics. For many years Anglicans had been contented to leave it to the executioner and the gaoler to maintain their side in argument against Rome; and they did prudently, for the argument was certainly strong. "If you make your voice heard in England you shall be hanged and embowelled." That was the Anglican argument under "the great Elizabeth." "If you do not keep quiet you shall be thrown into prison, and only let out on giving a promise to leave England, and never return to it." That was the form which the same argument took in the earlier years of George III. Both have unquestionably considerable force. They are worth considering carefully. But the repeal of the great mass of the penal laws, by depriving Anglicans of these arguments, made it essential to them to devise some other. One of the earliest of the Oxford Tracts began with the words, "The controversy with the Romanists has come upon us like a summer shower." And so it was. All of a sudden it became necessary that Anglicans, who had so long been content with attacking dissenters for violating "Christian unity," "Apostolical order," and the like, found themselves under the necessity of proving, if they could, that the same reproof did not belong to themselves.

It was one of the pregnant sayings attributed to Charles II., that the Church of England used Roman Catholic arguments against the dissenters, and dissenting arguments against the Roman Catholics. And nothing could be more true. Against the dissenters, as long as it had nothing to fear from Catholics, it had urged, in most edifying language, the duty and necessity of visible unity, of submission to the authorities of the Church, of trusting not to private judgment but to Apostolic tradition. Suddenly all these guns which they had loaded were turned against their own position. In the earlier days of the Oxford movement they tried to silence this battery by the same artillery which they had been accustomed to use in the war against the dissenters. The 36th number of the first volume of the "Oxford Tracts," professes to give an "account of the religious sects at present existing in England." It begins by teaching that "the English Church, which is a true branch or portion of the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ, receives and teaches the entire truth of God." And then it goes on:—"The parties which are separated from and opposed to the Church may be divided into three classes. 1. Those who reject the truth." These are enumerated as Socinians, Jews, Deists, and Atheists. 2. "Those who hold and teach a *part*, but

not the whole of the truth." These are Presbyterians, Independents, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers. And, 3. "Those who teach more than the truth." These are Romanists or Papists, Swedenborgians, Southcotians, and Irvingites. The tract ended with a pathetic address to the reader. "Churchman, whosoever thou art, that readest the list of follies and errors in the second and third classes into which the pride of man's heart and the wiles of Satan have beguiled so many of those who call upon the name of the Lord Jesus," &c., &c. Then it adds:—"From each of these three classes, the Church in England has undergone persecution. 1. In the fourth and fifth centuries, from those who rejected the truth (*i.e.* the heathen). 2. In the sixteenth century, from those who hold more than the truth, when the Papists or Romanists burned alive those who rejected their corrupt additions to the Catholic faith. 3. In the seventeenth century, from those who teach less than the truth, when the Protestant dissenters expelled and barbarously treated the clergy, shut up the churches, and forbade the use of the English Liturgy. . . . At the present time, these three classes of opponents have united their forces, and unbelievers, Papists, and Protestant dissenters, obeying Satan's bidding, are endeavouring to do that together which they have failed to do singly; namely, to overthrow and destroy our branch of the Catholic and Apostolic Church. And it is not improbable that God, for our correction and improvement, and for the glory of His name, may again put the faith and constancy of His servants to the proof, by permitting them to suffer afflictions for His name's sake;" and it goes on to say that "if we will be true to Him He will be true to us, and will protect the Church of His Son, which is built on the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, &c., and concerning which Church that Son has said that 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'"

Many are the thoughts which throng upon one's mind on reading such words as these, when we remember that the men most directly responsible for them were men of unquestionable integrity and uprightness, and that at least the leader of them gave the strongest possible proof of his integrity by abandoning the cause to which he had so long and so zealously devoted his unequalled gifts and labours, as soon as he was convinced that it was not the cause of God. Most important is the lesson which this may teach us in carrying on our present controversies. It often happens that in reading the writings of the Ritualists and Unionists of the present day, Catholics are tempted to exclaim, "It is impossible that men can really be in good faith who profess to believe all this and yet remain separate from the Catholic Church." And this painful suspicion is the more natural because all their worldly interests, all their natural feelings unite to dictate the course they are now pursuing. Many of them are already benefiting by the emoluments of

the Anglican Establishment; all are looking forward to them; and it can hardly be doubted that if only they are able to retain their positions in it, the time will come when some of them at least will rise to its highest places. To say (as they now do) that the profession of their opinions excludes men from preferment, is absurd; for so far as it is now the truth, and it is so only in a very limited degree, it was much more the truth with the "Evangelicals," until less than fifty years ago, and yet the time soon came when their peculiar phraseology was almost a condition *sine quâ non* of rising to the highest places of the Establishment. Dr. Pusey again is already the favourite with the same men who, in 1843, condemned him as a heretic. And, more than all, to abandon the Anglican communion would be to subject their children to the greatest social disadvantages; for, however consistent Protestants may say that they prefer avowed "Papists" to "Jesuits in disguise," who eat the bread of the Protestant Church that they may undermine it, it is notorious that no one was ever disinherited, or turned out of doors by father, mother, or rich relations, no marriage was ever broken off, no one was ever cut by near relations or dear friends, in consequence of adopting any views however inconsistent they may really be, and may be seen to be, with an Anglican position, so long as the person is only believed to be in no danger of "joining the Church of Rome." Just so far as people are believed to be in serious danger of conversion to the Catholic Church, so far they become objects of suspicion, not on account of what they are, but from fear of what may follow. And above all, young people are not in any degree objects of suspicion because they are known to be educated in the most advanced Unionist views, while their being brought up as "Papists" makes them just as much disliked as their parents themselves. This at least is not unreasonable; because experience shows that the children brought up as Unionists are just as likely as any one else to be Protestants of any other class, while those brought up "Papists" may lose all religion whatever, but are quite certain never to be Protestants.

All these considerations must make every Unionist leader feel that he will make the greatest conceivable sacrifice by submitting to the Catholic Church. And there is one other consideration which, with many at least, may perhaps weigh more than all the rest. They are now in the position perhaps more than any other attractive to human frailty. They are admired and followed party leaders. The *ipse dixit* of a Unionist clergyman (especially if he happens to be in London) is taken as almost infallible by multitudes of men and women, especially in the very classes of society in which such a following adds most to his personal importance. If he becomes a Catholic he at once becomes simply nobody. He

is merely "the last convert," a layman who is supposed by many people to be taking too much upon himself if he so much as expresses any opinion upon any religious question. For instance, to say nothing of the living, compare the state of the late William Dodsworth, a man most highly and justly revered and loved, and whose name is still most warmly cherished by many friends. Still what was his position before and after 1850. In the balance of faith indeed, by which he estimated them, his sacrifices were nothing; because, however great they might be, they weighed no more than nothing against the opposite scale, for they were weighed against "a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." But estimated by any natural standard, he had been a leader of very considerable importance, and he became simply an individual lay Catholic.

When we remember that this is the alternative set before the Unionist leaders, it is impossible not to feel, that everything that the world or nature can ever urge must be urging them to remain in their present position. And then turn to their own defence of that position, and it is so weak and inconsistent that it seems almost impossible that any man can really be deceived by it. What wonder then that many Catholics feel tempted to doubt, whether they can possibly be in good faith in defending by arguments so feeble their own determination to hold a position, which they are under temptations so overpowering not to abandon.

We would beg any Catholic who under such circumstances may be tempted to harsh judgment, to read the extracts which we have given above from the first volume of the Oxford Tracts, and remember that they were published by men whose good faith it is impossible to doubt. For the whole edifice which is represented in the paper we have quoted as an impregnable fortress, is so utterly frail that to address argument against any part of it seems like discharging real cannon against the fortifications of some castle on the stage, made of painted, paper pasteboard, and canvas. And yet for a while even master-minds were deluded by such sophisms. Such is the force of the prejudices of education.

The change from the state of things then existing to that which we now see, and which has led Anglicans, in great numbers, to undertake the defence of a new position which Mr. Rhodes's book lays in ruins, was brought about, as we have already said, by the necessity of controversy with Catholics. Could they only have been kept silent by the old-fashioned arguments, nothing could have have been easier than to have urged against Protestant dissenters the arguments of that tract, which assumed that the Church of England is a true branch of the Catholic Church. That once assumed, all the rest followed naturally enough. But that was exactly the point which "Romanists" would not admit. And the attempt to

prove it was fatal. Hitherto, as Charles II. said, Catholic arguments had served their turn. Now the Anglicans had, once more, to do with an opponent, against whom, as he truly said, they could use none but Protestant ones. To say that the Church of England is the whole Catholic and Apostolic Church, and that all other Bodies maintain either more or less than the Truth, was too palpably absurd. The only possible alternative, then, was either to deny that visible unity is necessary, that is, to fall back, openly and avowedly, upon the position of the Protestant dissenters, or else to make out, somehow or other, that visible unity actually does exist between the Anglican and the Roman Churches.

And this last is, in truth, as much a "dissenting argument" as the other; for if England and Rome are, at this moment, one Church, why are not the Wesleyans, the Independents, and the Baptists just as much one with the Anglican Church? No supporter of the system, so far as we know, has ever explained what he considers necessary in order to constitute any society of Christians a "branch of the Catholic and Apostolic Church." What they do say—and upon this there is a degree of agreement very unusual among them—is, that the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican are true branches of the Church, and that no others are. It is obvious to ask why are they, and if they are, why are no others? As far as appears, the answer to this question, in the minds of the Unionists, is, that these three were all parts of the Catholic Church at some former time, say in the seventh century; that all three of them still retain the Apostolical succession of bishops, priests, and deacons; that their bishops at this day remain in possession of the same sees then held by Catholic bishops; and, lastly, that neither of them has adopted any heresy. We need hardly say that these three conditions assume as facts a multitude of statements which, so far from being capable of proof, can be most easily disproved; for instance, that the existing Anglican communion is really the same body as the Church of England which existed when Elizabeth came to the throne, the fact being notorious that Elizabeth ejected all the Anglican bishops except one, and put into their place men holding different doctrines, and with whom they refused to hold communion. Again it assumes the validity of Anglican orders. Again, that the Anglican communion at the present day, and ever since the accession of Elizabeth, has held and taught no heresy. But, not to urge these, and a multitude of other matters of fact, now let us take them for granted and see what the theory assumes. This is, that no society, being a branch of the Catholic Church, and in communion with it, can ever cease to be Catholic by any conceivable act, unless it breaks off the succession of validly-ordained bishops. We may be asked, why we do not add, or

unless it authoritatively adopts some condemned heresy. But, in truth, we do not believe that this is, in the minds of the Unionists, an additional condition. If we rightly understand them, they imagine that no National Church, once a true branch of the Church Catholic, can possibly take any act which will make it heretical, so long as it maintains the valid consecration of bishops, priests, and deacons, and fills with the bishops, thus validly consecrated, the sees formerly held by Catholic bishops. If, at this moment, all the archbishops and bishops of Spain (who are now unquestionably in canonical possession of their sees) were to meet in council, and pass a unanimous vote in favour of Arian doctrine, and should ever afterwards require from all persons whom they ordained or admitted to the cure of souls, or consecrated to the episcopal office, subscription to that decree, we are not sure they would hold that the "Spanish branch of the Catholic Church" had by that act ceased to be Catholic, and become a mere heretical sect. Possibly, as long as the case is merely hypothetical, many of them might declare they should pronounce it heretical. But of this at least we are certain, that if they did so they would act quite inconsistently with their own principles, and utterly undermine the argument (to dignify it with that name) by which they attempt to prove that the Anglican communion holds Catholic doctrine. For, observe why they say that it holds, for instance, the doctrine of the sacrifice in the Eucharist, or, again, that Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, or Extreme Unction, are sacraments. To take this last case, the article adopted by the whole Anglican communion in convocation, and subscribed by every Anglican "bishop" and clergyman for centuries past, expressly declares that "the five commonly called sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for sacraments of the gospel, being such as have grown partly out of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in Scripture; but yet have not like nature of sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper." Now when they are asked on what ground they hold that the Church of England holds these five to be true sacraments, or that it holds that there is any true sacrifice in the Eucharist, they reply that the Church of England, being Catholic, holds Catholic doctrine, and this being Catholic doctrine, the Church of England holds it. They do not deny that the reformers, by whom these articles were drawn up, intended them to express heretical doctrine; but they say that they must be interpreted by the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and that what might be held by a few wicked men who, unhappily, held high places in the Church of England in the sixteenth century, makes no more difference to them than what may have been held by other men in the eighteeenth —Hoadley, for

instance. It is plain that this argument would equally prove that the Spanish Church, in the case supposed, would still remain Catholic. We believe, therefore, that whether they know it or not, what the Unionists really hold is, that it is only by losing the succession of validly-consecrated bishops, that any body of Christians once in communion with the Catholic Church can ever cease to be so.

It is curious to observe that while, in the last thirty years, there has been so great an advance towards Catholic doctrine as is measured by comparing the defence of Anglicanism urged by Dr. Chalmers, and accepted by zealous Anglicans, with the way of thinking and speaking in the present day; yet the necessities of controversy with Catholics have obliged the defenders of Anglicanism really, though probably without perceiving it, to take up a far more Protestant position than they did when, thirty years ago, the Oxford Tract writers boldly declared that the Anglican Church is Catholic and Apostolic, and Methodists, Quakers, Papists, &c., all heretics. This was, at least, an intelligible ground. It was so far consistent with Catholic principles, that it represented the Catholic Church as one visible Body, distinct from all others, but then it was so evidently absurd and contrary to fact, that it could only be urged by a man who was really thinking only of dissenters. Now that Catholics, not dissenters, are first in the thoughts of Anglican writers, they are found to take what is, in fact, a purely Protestant position, namely, that all sects are equally Catholic, although, inconsistently, they add to it the condition that they must have bishops validly consecrated.

It is to the examination of this theory that Mr. Rhodes addresses his book. He begins by joyfully admitting the vast change which has passed over many members, at least, of the Established Church.

> It is a hopeful sign for our time and country that men most distinguished for their piety, learning, and position in the communion of the Established Church of England have freely and openly avowed their earnest desires for the reunion of Christendom, and have made direct efforts and proposals in order to ascertain a basis on which negotiations for a general reconciliation might be opened, not only with the distant East, but with the more neighbouring Church of Rome, which, till recently, was regarded even by the learned and the good amongst their body, as an object of mysterious and religious dread, a bearer of subtle and deadly poison, and one whose very fascinations were a cause and reason for mistrust. Many of the same Anglican body now acknowledge that Church, at least, as their patriarchal see, and anxiously hope for the day when they may be no longer severed from the communion.
>
> This is the change of the right hand of the Most High. (p. 2.)

It is as heartily sympathizing with these desires, that our author sets himself to point out the fundamental mistake of the Anglicans who have written on behalf of union in our own day. For what is more truly an "eirenicon" than a work which clears away illusions? Many Anglicans have a vague notion that although the terms on which they desire reunion are rejected now, the time will come when, as they express it, Rome, humbled by trials and persecutions, will become wiser, and consent to accept them. As long as this delusion prevails, union is indeed impossible. The whole order of the new creation must pass away before it is possible that the Catholic Church should admit, that bodies situated as the Anglican and Greek schisms now are, are in any sense part of the one body, or branches of the one tree of life.

> Rusticus expectat dum defluat amnis; at ille
> Labitur, et labetur in omne volubilis ævum.

Until the Lord return, His Church must hold her course unbroken, and no temptation, however great, can ever induce her to abandon her fundamental principle.

Mr. Rhodes says:—

> As long as her Divine commission is unacknowledged by those who are seeking for reunion, she can make no response to their advances, except by earnest exhortations, and unceasing prayer for them to God.
>
> Underlying this great difficulty there is another connected with, it but requiring special consideration. The Anglican proposals for reunion assume as a first principle that the present divisions of Christendom, so far at least as regards the three great communions of Rome, the East, and England, though grave, still are not vital, for that the outwardly divided bodies continue inwardly one in Christ. The maintainers of this opinion do not deny that there is only one Church of Christ, and that outside that Church there is no salvation, but they assert that essential unity may exist without being visible, and not only (as is allowed by Rome) that individuals invincibly ignorant may belong to the soul of the Church though outwardly separated from her visible communion; but also, that the separate and independent religious bodies which have been mentioned, though visibly divided and without any outward inter-communion, nevertheless form together, in the sight of God, that one Holy Catholic Church which is animated by His one Spirit, and constitutes His one ambassador to fallen man, being in reality the one Body of His Son. Rome rejects this doctrine, and asserts that the Church of Christ can suffer no division, either visible or invisible, but must continue to the eyes of all men always and only one, outwardly as well as inwardly; and that the visible inter-communion of all the parts and all the members is essential to their life, and also to the integrity of the one Body; that without it they cease to be animated by one Spirit, and that apart from visible communion with this one Church, no religious body can be a channel of the Grace

of Christ; nor any single soul attain salvation, excepting in the case of individuals whose ignorance is invincible in the sight of God. (p. 4.)

The object of Mr. Rhodes's book is to examine this new Anglican theory, and to show that it is strictly impossible that the Catholic Church should ever, under any circumstances, admit it. Were it possible for her to do so, she would deny her first principles. Her office as the Teacher of Truth would be gone, she would cease to be the bearer of salvation to the penitent.

> Evil then would enter here,
> The holy stream which cleanseth sin,
> Would flow from hence polluted in its springs,
> And they who gasp upon its banks in death
> Feel no salvation.

Mr. Rhodes, then, is really seeking peace and union by the only means by which it is conceivable that they should be attained, by showing that the path by which our Anglican brethren have hoped to attain them is for ever blocked up, but that there is another path ever open and inviting their feet.

The work divides itself into two parts. The first, comprised in the two first sections, states and explains first the Catholic doctrine of unity, and next the theory on the subject put forward by recent Anglican writers.

> In the first [section] I propose in a cursory and general manner to assign reasons for belief in the necessity of visible unity in the Church, and in its actual and permanent continuance, showing where it must be looked for and may be found at the present day.
>
> In the second I propose to examine more particularly into the previously mentioned theory of the existence of invisible unity under outward division, as set forward by Dr. Pusey in the Eirenicon, and by Dr. Forbes, the Anglican Bishop of Brechin, in his explanation of the Nicene Creed, and as generally maintained by the more advanced members of the same communion. (p. 5.)

These two sections are developed with much learning and thought, and we cannot but feel that the work meets a want not hitherto supplied, and at the present moment of great importance. It is the nature of falsehood and heresy to change its arguments almost from year to year, and consequently Truth, although herself unchanging, is compelled continually to turn her weapons in a new direction. The defenders of the Catholic religion in England, a few years ago, had to meet assaults which professed to prove it "an apostasy"—"anti-Christ,"—the mystery of iniquity. They were compelled to defend its theology and morality; to prove that

the confessional was not, as Anglican divines argued, corrupt and corrupting; that the sacrifice of the Mass was not, as they proclaimed, idolatry, "a dangerous, false, and blasphemous deceit." But a few years have passed, and the most religious and learned members of the same communion, by whom these foul charges were so lately urged, declare that our religion and their own not only are, but always were, one and the same; that we are, and always were, only two branches of the same stem; and that all through the long years in which laws which had been passed by the votes of Anglican prelates, and were executed by Anglican judges, were punishing priests with death by tortures, merely for offering the holy sacrifice of the Mass, the clergy of the Established Church themselves were really holding the same doctrine with us, and offering the same sacrifice.

This strange doctrine, we know, is now received by many whose minds grace is attracting from darkness to light, and therefore our author has done good service in refuting it, as he has in these volumes.

And here the book might naturally end, for the new Anglican notion of an invisible union between the branches of the same visible Church is in itself so unreasonable, that the great difficulty in refuting it is to state it intelligibly, and the arguments by which Mr. Rhodes supports the Catholic teaching would be quite enough, by themselves, to exclude it. But the main—in fact the only—plausible argument in support of the Anglican theory is not that it agrees with the promises and commands of our Blessed Lord, but that experience proves that at different periods of the Church individuals and bodies to whom no one denies the name of Catholic have, as a matter of fact, remained separated from the visible unity of the Church; whence it is inferred that such separation in the case of the Anglican communion cannot prove that it is not Catholic.

This argument carries its own refutation on its face, for its characteristic is that it appeals to sight against faith, and that it is negative and destructive, not tending to confirm and establish the faith. It is one of a class of similar arguments which have ever been the favourite weapons of unbelief against the Truth. For it seems to have been the will of God, that both under the old dispensation and the new, His precepts and promises should be plain and explicit, but that there should always be more or less of difficulty in reconciling them with the actual appearance of things going on in the world before men's eyes. Of all arguments against the Divine origin and authority of Christianity itself, this is, to say the least, the most plausible. "You tell us," say unbelievers, "that God has become man, and has lived and died among men to found a Church, and that His Eternal Spirit still lives in it; and yet we

see that the members of that Church are not substantially different from other men." Those who reject the sacramental doctrine argue in exactly the same. "You tell us," they say, "that every baptized child is really and truly incorporated into Christ, and becomes flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone; but we do not see that the multitude of baptized persons are different from those who are unbaptized. You tell us that in the Eucharist you receive Christ Himself as the Life of your soul, but we no not see that those who receive it are really better or more like Him than other people." While, therefore, they do not deny that the words of our Blessed Lord, literally understood, would teach the sacramental system, they conclude that such cannot have been His meaning, because they say it does not agree with what we actually see in the world. Under the Old Testament the same principle was at work. It was true, indeed, that "the Lord had chosen Jacob of Himself and Isreal for His own possession"; but the world at large did not see that the people of the Jews were so widely different from other nations as to force upon it the truth of the claim. Alas! it is, and ever has been, too true, that the glory of God in the world has been tarnished, not because He has failed to fulfil His promises, but because those to whom He has given them have not lived worthy of them. This Dr. Pusey would be the last to deny. He thinks indeed that what he maintains is actually an instance in point. He does not deny that real visible unity was designed by our Blessed Lord, but says, that through human infirmity, it has repeatedly been violated, while yet both the parties separated from each other have remained Catholics.

In truth, however, both cases are really the same; for those who deny the doctrine of the sacraments would admit, that it was the fault of the receivers that they do not receive wonderful graces. It the baptism of infants, for instance, Protestants, who deny the gift of regeneration imparted to them, express their conviction that it would be given if the parents were hearty and earnest in their prayers for them. They deny only that God has, as His words would naturally imply, indissolubly connected the grace with the sacrament. Dr. Pusey's argument is in truth exactly the same. And even if the particular historical events he urges were as great difficulties as he thinks, there would be more of humble faith in believing that the promises of God really meant what they appear to mean, although there was something in those particular cases which we could not understand, than in arguing that His promise must mean less than all Catholics have always believed, because, if not, it is difficult to see how it can be reconciled with this or that particular case.

But the arguments by which it is attempted to prove that there have at certain times been Catholics who have yet been per-

manently out of communion with the Church in visible subjection to the see of Peter, can hardly be said to be so much as plausible. Mr. Rhodes enumerates all the cases to which Anglican writers have appealed, and examines each of them in detail. They are, first, the case of the difference between the Pope S. Victor and the Asiatic churches, about the time of Easter; next, the contest about the rebaptism of heretics in the time of S. Cyprian of Carthage, and of Pope Stephen; thirdly, the case of S. Meletius, and the divisions in the Church of Antioch in his day; fourthly, the case of the Celtic churches in Great Britain, between the landing of S. Augustine in Kent in A.D. 596, and the final submission of the Welsh Christians to the practice established in the rest of Christendom, about the middle of the eighth century. In addition to these, Dr. Forbes appeals to the case of the antipopes and their followers; but this case Mr. Rhodes, who finds it necessary to devote a whole volume to the dispute about the Celtic churches, is able dismiss in a single page. The reason is both obvious and instructive. It is, that with regard to the antipopes the historical facts are certain and notorious, so that all that is necessary is to apply to them the general principles of Catholic doctrine. With regard to the British and Welsh churches, on the other hand, the difficulty is to ascertain what the facts really were, and it is to this that Mr. Rhodes devotes nearly a whole volume. And this illustrates a remarkable fact. It may be laid down as a general principle to which there is really no exception, that whenever any historical event is referred to, as affording an argument against the claims and authority of the Catholic Church and the Sovereign Pontiff, the plausibility of the objection, in every instance, is greater exactly in proportion to the obscurity of the period and the uncertainty of our knowledge with regard to it. This is so certain that we are sure no fair man will deny it. He may say indeed that it is unfortunate that little is known of the particulars of this or that case, because if they were more exactly known, they would no doubt fully establish his argument; but in each case, exactly in proportion to the importance of the inference to be derived from any fact will he admit the unfortunate obscurity of the fact itself. Mr. Rhodes says: —

> The instances which are brought forward in behalf of what may be described as the theory of invisible unity, are not selected from any well-known and uncontroverted passages of the Church's history; they all of them belong to periods and refer to circumstances over which, owing to the absence of authentic documents, there hangs a heavy cloud of obscurity. So far as it is possible to pierce the cloud, and by a careful criticism to unite the divided links of evidence which have come down to us, the result of an impartial investigation will not be such as to warrant the very decided and unqualified assertions which are made by the advocates of the theory, in a few

short sentences, respecting the separated position of the persons or the churches appealed to in its support. Were the subject merely historical, and did it involve no other consequences than the discovery of certain facts, still the love of truth alone might have been sufficient to have deterred conscientious men from rashly venturing on assertions of such importance, on points notoriously open to question, without one word of proof or the slightest intimation of any doubt. Yet such uncertain instances are unhesitatingly produced in positive and laconic sentences, in support of a theory which regards the definition of the Church of Christ, the only ark of man's salvation, and which is put forward as a practical rule of conduct, in a matter that involves the alternative of eternal life or death. (p. 5.)

This is most true and well put. For ourselves we could not help asking ourselves, Is it possible that Dr. Pusey and Bishop Forbes can really think it so certain that S. Aidan, for instance, was not in communion with Rome, as to be willing to risk all upon the question? If there were any means of ascertaining it in some manner which both parties admit to be convincing (*e. g.*, if we could call up and interrogate S. Aidan himself in the manner which Mr. Home thinks he can practise), would Dr. Pusey be willing to hazard say ten thousand pounds upon the question, or, even more, would he stake his life upon it? We cannot for a moment believe it. How comes it, then, that a man so conscientious and religious can really be willing to take the risk of living and dying out of communion with the Church of Christ, if S. Aidan really was in the communion of the See of Rome? The true answer, we doubt not, is that these historical arguments are not, in truth, the grounds upon which men themselves remain members of the Anglican communion. They have made up their minds (those of them, that is, who are really without doubt) upon grounds wholly different. But after their minds have been made up, they read history with their already received convictions firmly rooted in their minds, and they not unnaturally find facts which seem to them to confirm it; for, being already fully persuaded that Christians of ancient times did not consider communion with Rome essential to the Catholic character, any fact or expression capable of being explained by that supposition, but equally so by many others, is at once referred by them to that, as the all-sufficient explanation. This is, in fact, what we mean when we speak of the power of prejudice. It is not that a man believes, without evidence, whatever falls in with his prejudice, but that everything which does not absolutely contradict this prejudice appears to him evidence in its favour, because it is capable of being explained on that hypothesis. Most of us probably have observed how this works in the case of a suspicious temper. It occurs to a suspicious man that his best friend is trying to deceive and impose upon him. He would not, however, come,

without proof, to the conclusion that he is doing so. But then, unluckily, his suspicious temper leads him to notice every word spoken in simplicity by the object of his suspicions, and to muse, What can have been the meaning of this or that? Its meaning, very likely, would seem to any one else perfectly simple. But the suspicion which has already obtained possession of the man's mind is to him a fact; all he wants is a theory to connect other facts with it. And this he makes out for himself, until at last he himself does not know which are facts of which he can be sure, and which merely the creations of his own mind, for the purpose of forming what he sees and hears into one whole with what he suspects. At last he is ready to depose, perhaps even on oath, and without the slightest intention of saying anything untrue, to events, words, and actions which never had any objective existence apart from his own thoughts, but which his suspicions have so vividly pictured to him that he cannot for a moment doubt he saw or heard them. Thus it comes about that

> Trifles light as air
> Are to the jealous confirmations strong
> As proofs from holy writ,

and the prejudices of a man, however honest, who goes to the study of the Fathers of the Church and of ecclesiastical history fully convinced beforehand that the early Christians were sound Anglicans, make it quite as impossible for him to read the facts of history in any other light than that of his preconceived convictions.

Space would fail us if we were to follow our author through the details of any one of the different periods of history which have been alleged in support of the Anglican theory. But this part of his book is at once the most original and the most important. The number is great of religiously-minded, well-intentioned people, whom God in His mercy is attracting towards the Church, who have never studied history for themselves, perhaps have had neither opportunity nor learning for such a study, but who are held back, because the conviction which forces itself upon their own minds that the Catholic name and the promises annexed to it belong only to the communion ruled by the successors of S. Peter, is overruled by the confident assertion of some Anglican guide, who assures them, exactly in the "unhesitating, positive, and laconic" sentences of which our author justly complains, that it is an admitted fact that S. Cyprian, S. Meletius, S. Aidan, and many more, attained to sanctity, although they lived and died out of the communion of the See of Rome. It is difficult to meet such cases except by prayer for persons so deluded, for nowhere is the number greater than in England of persons who wholly surrender

their judgments, and subject their very souls to the irresponsible dictation of fallible guides, some of whom are well known to be in the habit of saying, with a confidence which makes one tremble, "I will answer for your soul if you remain faithful to the Church of your baptism; leave all the responsibility to me"; assuring them at the same time that the proofs of sanctity in the Anglican communion are so overpowering as to make it "a blasphemy against the Holy Ghost" to question that it is the true Church of Christ. By great swelling words like these it is within our own known knowledge that simple hearts have been frightened from acting upon the convictions which the grace of God has in mercy granted them. Such is the "liberty of private judgment" with which the change of religion has invested multitudes of the most conscientious English men and women; it has taken from them the easy yoke of the Church, which speaks in the name and by the authority of Christ, to subject them to men who speak by their own. So are the words of our Blessed Master fulfilled. "I am come in My Father's name, and ye receive Me not; if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." Such persons are often too much in subjection to the usurped authority of their spiritual guides to be allowed to read for themselves anything which goes against the opinion imposed upon them. But when this is not the case, we believe there can hardly be any book so likely to meet the confident statements of such guides as that of our author. We can hardly imagine any one carefully reading his examination of the facts, with regard, for instance, to S. Meletius, or again that with regard to the Celtic Churches of Great Britain, which fills almost the whole of his second volume, without coming to the conclusion that the men whose authority is now appealed to in defence of the position of the Church of England would have been the first indignantly to repudiate it, if it had ever been brought before them.

Our author has, with most conscientious care, examined every particular of the histories to which appeal has been made, and his book is evidently the result of long and diligent labour and thought. If it should occur to any reader to suggest that he may have read the history in the light of his own foregone conclusion in favour of the Roman Church, as Dr. Pusey, Dr. Forbes, and their fellows have read it in the light of their own opposite conclusions, it may be well to remark, that in the present day we have, literally, hundreds of Anglican students, once fully convinced of the strength of the Anglican position, but who have gradually lost that certain conviction in a course of study and prayer, on which they entered in the strongest confidence that it must tell in support of Anglicanism. Such men certainly have not been swayed by prejudice, for their prejudices were all in the opposite direction; and it may add to the confidence of a reader in the work before us, that its author was one of these. Is

there a single instance of a Catholic student who has been led by similar studies to embrace the Anglican theory? The volumes before us evidently express the conviction to which their author has been brought by a most full and dispassionate consideration of the subject. But they have also a degree of authority, to which the mere conviction of a single individual, however carefully formed, could not be entitled. He has so far distrusted himself as to submit his work to high ecclesiastical authority. It has obtained the sanction of the Lord Bishop of Cork, in whose diocese it was commenced, of a theologian appointed by the Archbishop of Westminster, where it is published; and by "more than one distinguished theologian of our own isles." Moreover, he adds, "in the summer of 1867, on the occasion of the centenary of S. Peter and S. Paul, I took the occasion of personally submitting it to two Professors of Theology, belonging, respectively, to two of the highest ecclesiastical colleges in Rome. One of these was the Reverend Father Cardella, then of the Roman College, now Rector of the "Civiltà Cattolica"; and he has kindly permitted me to make this use of his name."

We cannot pass by another point which makes the book doubly likely to be useful to Anglicans. It is written in a tone which we think can hardly excite an angry feeling in any reader. The author says:

> It has been my anxious desire, throughout the whole of this work, to avoid any term, or mode of expression, which might give offence. But since terms imply principles, and principles do not admit of compromise, I have, at times, felt some difficulty in the selection of my language. It appeared to me, however, that the simplest course was to adopt the expressions now most in use, intending them in their commonly received sense. (p. 14.)

That by this, or anything else, he can have avoided all offence, is more than any man could hope; for the truth is, that when the sacred duty which every writer owes to the truth compels him, whether he will or not, to say things in themselves painful, it is impossible that he should convey his meaning in any words, however carefully chosen, which will make it pleasing. People talk of "breaking to" a widow or an orphan the news of the sudden death of a husband or a father. Alas! can any one who has ever undertaken such an office really feel that he was able in any degree to succeed in it? There is no possibility of preparing the mind, as we do the body by chloroform, for the performance of an operation. And to bring home to the inmost convictions of some confident Anglican that the communion which he has long been assured by those who have claimed his confidence, was from God, and charged with the richest spiritual blessings, is really only an imposture, invented by crafty and lecherous

tyrants, with the aid of false and craven prelates, and that it has no authority to speak in the name of any being higher and more sacred than Henry and Elizabeth; this is indeed an operation which no skill will ever make otherwise than heart-rending. Happily, this task is not commonly, if indeed ever, laid upon us. All around us there are good and genial hearts, longing for the truth, whose confidence in the false system in which they were trained has been shaken, not by the words of any man, but by Divine grace, and by the course of events. For the course of this world is ordered by the good Providence of God, and He has so ordered it, that while Truth is everlasting and appears to perish only for a while, that it may revive again more glorious than ever, it is the nature, the inseparable condition of falsehood, to flourish for a time and then to die away. And when its time comes, nothing can restore it.

Debemur Libitinæ nos nostraque.

How should human systems be abiding, when man himself perishes like a leaf? The history of past heresies would have led us to expect, what experience already confirms, that Protestantism as a religion might last some three centuries, but that then its death-hour would have arrived. Accordingly it is evident to all thoughtful observers that its time as a religion has come. It has deceived the nations long enough, and now it is impossible to mix with men in any Protestant country without perceiving, that it has wholly lost the confidence even of those whom we should most have expected to find satisfied and at rest in it. The Anglican movement of the present day is an attempt made, we willingly believe, by well-intentioned and honest men, to breathe new life into a system which must die, not because it has any new or accidental disease, or has suffered any wound or violence, but by the natural and legitimate working of the principles which were borne with it, and which in the time of its prosperity were its strength. Most necessary, therefore, it is that some better system should be within reach for the refuge of those who are daily finding the stay upon which they have hitherto leaned giving way under their weight. It is by the special Providence of God that at a period of our country's history so momentous, the Catholic Church, which for long years had almost ceased to be visible among us, has once more come forth from her hiding-places, and is holding out a sustaining arm to multitudes who, finding out that what they have hitherto believed was a deception, are in serious danger of supposing that there is nothing that deserves their belief. To men in such a state of mind we cannot but think that Mr. Rhodes's book will be a valuable assistance.

Art. VIII.—THE FALL OF THE FRENCH EMPIRE.

Historical Map of the War. London: Allnutt.

THE fall of the French empire is like a *coup d'état* struck by the hand of God Himself. In the whole course of human history there is no such sudden and surprising destruction of so great a dominion as this upon record. Three months ago it seemed to be the grandest power upon the earth —with the most variously gifted, patriotic, and homogeneous population, with the most admirably situated, fertile, and commodious territory, whose ports lay open to the Atlantic, and commanded the Mediterranean; whose soil grew corn and sugar, wine and tobacco, the potato and the olive, silk and wool with equal ease; with a language that interpreted between all other nations; with a capital that was the capital of half the world, and the choice focus of human genius; with an army whose eagles, within a few years victory had attended in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America; whose flag had floated over Rome, Athens, Constantinople, Sebastopol, Pekin, Milan, and Mexico; with a great code; with a great system of administration; with a political constitution whose edifice, patiently and skilfully raised on the embers of revolution and the *débris* of dead institutions, had lately been crowned by liberty; with a dynasty which had just received the solemn sanction of the votes of eight millions of men, and to which a higher sanction than that of man seemed to attach—for within two generations had been born of that dynasty rulers possessing the most complex, the most consummate, yet the most curiously contrasted talents for the art of government in all its most arduous and various tasks. Where is it all now? Where is Babylon the great? And where the Cæsars? It has not so much perished as vanished. It is like the fall of a planet from its place. Prussia was more rapidly and even more completely crushed by the military power of France in the war of 1808; but Prussia was only kneaded into a nation by her calamity, and the common disaster only added a new title to the crown of the Hohenzollerns. The civil authority of Louis Philippe, which had lasted nearly as long, and was of scarcely less *prestige* for its prudence of policy, was dismissed almost as abruptly and contumeliously in 1848. Yet Louis Philippe had failed in no foreign war; and what he did for the military honour of France he did well. Paris owes her fortifications to his reign; every officer whose exploits added a ray of glory to the Empire, from Pelissier to

Trochu, was trained and was even already distinguished in his time. But war and revolution combined to consume the Empire. The thunderbolt and the earthquake smote it together. It had arisen in a time of revolution, itself revolutionizing the revolution, acting against the system of political conspiracy and insurrection which surrounded it, by conspiracy at the centre of the State, and insurrection in the ranks of the army; and then proclaiming that it was Peace. In the end, its fate was risked on the issue of war, in the hope that war, at least, might prove a safety-valve to revolution. And so the great dominion, so splendid, so solid, which had made war so dexterously, which had made peace so prosperous, the name of whose much-contriving and mysterious chief has been daily on the lips of all men from the rising to the setting of the sun for twenty years of this quickest and busiest of ages, is all of a sudden torn up by the roots and flung away like a weed.

It is strange that this tremendous catastrophe should find its scene in the streets of Sedan, a place destined to mark memorable dates in history. That town is not an ancient possession of the Crown of France. It formed an independent principality under the Duc de Bouillon until the time of the conspiracy of Cinq Mars. Its cession thus marks the epoch in which a Duke of Orleans first plotted against the head of his house. He who knows what ill that unnatural family feud has wrought, from the days when Cardinal Richelieu grasped the keys of the impregnable citadel in his dying hand, which had raised the French monarchy to a position of such exalted power and repute, to the days when, after its disastrous capitulation, the old Orleanist Premier, M. Thiers, started on his hopeless cruise from court to court in search of an ally, at the bidding of two boisterous barristers, who have been suddenly flung from the gutter into the Louvre, is master of one of the principal clues of French history. The art of war always makes such rapid progress among men, that even between the time of Richelieu and the time of the Revolution, Sedan had ceased to be considered impregnable, and had even come to be regarded as hardly defensible. There can scarcely be a more curious coincidence of date and place in history than that between the position of General Dumouriez there on the 31st of August, 1792, and that of Marshal MacMahon there on the 31st of August, 1870. The grandfather of the present King of Prussia was marching on Paris. Hohenlohe beleaguered Thionville. Kahlkreuth was bombarding Verdun. Clerfait had arrived at Stenai. The French general seemed to be surrounded on all sides. "My little army would be in a mousetrap, cut off from Paris, from Kellermann and its magazines, if the Prussians were

to occupy the mountains with 20,000 men,"—so Dumouriez wrote to the minister of war at Paris on the 31st of August in the year afterwards called the year One of the first French Republic One and Indivisible. "These are the results of your defensive warfare;" he continued gloomily, "if it had not been for the taking of Longwy, I should never have gone to Sedan, and now I am compromised here without being able to save anything." In some such words may MacMahon have written, when beaten at Carignan and Beaumont, cut off from Paris, from Bazaine, and from his magazines, he found himself hemmed in at Sedan on the 31st of August of this year One of the third Republic—the third Republic, which can hardly yet be regarded as One, and which Count Bismarck proposes to divide. But by a sudden stroke of strategy, instinct with genius, courage, and velocity, Dumouriez broke through the German toils, and within a week completely turned the tide of war. Dillon, an Irish officer, who commanded the French van, cut his way through Clerfait's Austrians. Dumouriez had contrived, by skilfully masked marches, to reach Grandpré by the 4th of September. Dillon occupied the Islettes on the following day. The passes of the Argonnes, "the Thermopylæ of France," were thus secured. And, on the 5th of September, Dumouriez was able to write to the same minister of war these momentous words: —"If the King of Prussia advances on Paris now, he is a lost man." On the 5th of September, 1870, the Emperor Napoleon, prisoner of war, arrived at Cassel, and the King of Prussia, having given his army three days' rest, entered Rheims, where the kings of France were crowned of old, on his first day's march towards the walls of Paris.

As in the history of States there is no precedent for the utter and absolute collapse of the French empire, so in the history of war there is no such vast and terrible ruin as that of the French army. The French throughout this war have been circumvented, dislocated, and overwhelmed by the Prussians in a way more like that in which we have been accustomed to see Asiatics crushed by Europeans than like any result of war hitherto attained between two Western nations. Two months have now elapsed since the first shot was fired, and it may not certainly be said that the French have had the advantage in even one serious skirmish in the open field ever since. They have been beaten in nine pitched battles—at Weissenberg on the 4th of August, at Wöerth and at Forbach on the 6th, at Courcelles on the 14th, at Vionville on the 16th, at Gravelotte on the 18th, at Beaumont and at Carignan on the 30th, and before Sedan on the 2nd of September. In the course of exactly one month, measured day by day, from the taking of

Saarbruck, there was no French army at all in the field. What remained of it was invested in strong places, and so debarred from exercising any active influence on the course of the war; or was so utterly demoralized as to be inferior in discipline and courage to the Mobiles and the National Guard. Meantime the superiority of the Prussian army was proved to be a superiority of every military quality and capacity. In strategy, in tactics, in discipline, in fighting, in marching, in the special use of artillery, cavalry, and infantry, as well as in the combination of all arms, the Germans from the first shot established their mastery. The Emperor seemed to have taken the field without any plan of his own, without any theory as to the Prussian plans, without any adequate intelligence department. His military administration speedily and utterly broke down. Who may take the gauge of Marshal Lebœuf's incapacity? Over that calamitous name one drops a pall and passes on. But Marshal Niel was supposed to have so reorganized the army three years ago, that France should have a standing force ready to strike with, superior in numbers to that maintained by Germany on a peace footing, while her reserves were to have been mobilized, according to a plan which the Emperor himself wrote a pamphlet to explain, with at least equal rapidity. But the army that was sent to the frontier was hardly equal in numbers to the German corps that were ready to meet it; nor was it allowed to undertake any offensive operation until the Germans had had full time to embody their reserves and their Landwehr; and when the French standing army was destroyed, it transpired that there was no army of reserve. Of the Marshals who took the field, one was obliged to capitulate with an army of 100,000 men, and two others were surrounded and shut up within stone walls against their will, with another army of 100,000 men, and these three were the only French marshals who were in a condition to command. It cannot be truly said that there was even one general officer who distinguished himself by a single act of conspicuous military ability, while there were several of whom it is not much to say that the capitulation saved them from the court-martial. Again and again it happened, notably at Weissenberg, at Forbach, and at Beaumont, that a French division found itself surprised, not at night, or at dawn, or in the enemy's country, but at noon, while it was cooking, and so circumvented, had to accept battle at a minute's notice on the enemy's terms. No French general seemed to know where or when to expect a Prussian attack. They were not served by their spies. They had no outposts. They did not reconnoitre. Want of respect for their generals accordingly seems to have immediately blighted the discipline of the whole

army. The Germans found themselves, even before Sedan, encumbered with prisoners, who surrendered in thousands without shame, cursing their officers and their Emperor. The Emperor has always been a diligent student of the art of war, mainly, however, in its historical aspects, but he is no captain. He very nearly lost the battle of Magenta by an impromptu movement, skilfully repaired at great hazard by MacMahon. It were no reproach to him that he is ignorant of the conduct of war, for he never served with the army or saw a battle ranged until he was fifty years of age, but for the fact that he considered it due to the name and the rank that he bore to assume the command in chief. He not merely assumed, he seems to have exercised the chief command as long as it was possible for him to do so; and there can now be no doubt that this was an act of morbid folly. In the scale of military capacity, the Third Napoléon will occupy a place in history relatively to Von Moltke hardly so respectable as that in which Wurmser or Mack stood to the First Napoleon. But though no general, the Emperor has always been supposed to have a good knowledge of artillery; and in fact his experiments, of which the Cannon Napoléon and the building of the *Gloire* were the first results, have transformed the gunnery and the navies of the world. How then did it happen that he was ignorant of the fact that the Prussian artillery was so indefinitely superior to his own? In almost every battle, the French batteries were easily mastered by the Prussian fire; and in the end an army of 100,000 men, occupying a fortified town, had to submit to the unprecedented ignominy of laying down their arms, simply because a circle of Prussian cannon had been drawn around them. Its established superiority was such that the annihilation of the French army was supposed to be involved in any other issue. The Prussian artillery was generally supposed to be inferior to the Austrian when the war of 1866 was declared, and the Austrian artillery had been proved to be inferior to the French in the war of 1859; but the war of 1870 revealed the fact that the Prussians had got a new gun, whose power, whose very existence was unknown to the author of the Cannon Napoléon. The Prussian cavalry was generally thought, in 1866, by independent critics, to be far inferior to the Austrian cavalry, and none of the incidents of that war sufficed to reverse the presumption. Neither its artillery nor its cavalry was reckoned to be the strong arm of the Prussian army, but its steady, stalwart infantry. It may be doubted, however, whether any army was ever so well served by its cavalry as the Prussians have been during the present war. It is no exaggeration to say that the Prussian cavalry has been every-

where and the French cavalry has been nowhere. Like a cloud, the Uhlans masked the advance of the army; around its track they pervaded the country, sounding its resources, its forces, and its spirit. Their intelligence, their audacity, their indefatigable zeal and energy have immensely facilitated the Prussian advance. Thus unexpectedly predominant in cavalry and artillery, it is curious to consider that the arm in which the Prussians were supposed to be especially superior, their infantry, was not so perfectly equipped as the French. It is admitted on all hands that the Chassepot is a better weapon both in range and accuracy than the needle-gun. But it never availed to arrest the advance of a Prussian column; and the superior steadiness, the deliberate precision, and self-restraint of the Prussian fire compensated for the inferiority of their rifle. Nor is it to be forgotten that the French soldier, who made his first campaign with the Chassepot, had to unlearn the use of his old weapon as well as to learn the use of the new one; but that there was not a soldier in the Prussian ranks who had ever handled on parade another weapon than the needle-gun.

The prodigious growth of the Prussian power is a result to which the concurrence of so many causes was requisite, that it is difficult to treat it as a mere process of national development, or without looking in it for the signs of some vast imperfectly-manifest Providential design. Much is said of Teuton and Celt; but this is not the first war in which Teuton and Celt have crossed bayonets. In 1792, a Celtic army, which Edmund Burke described as "a band of strolling players headed by a mountebank," chased the Teuton out of France, and made the Rhine the line between the two races. Within the last two months, the Prussians have marched in a blaze of triumph from the streets of Saarbruck to the gates of Paris; but France is not yet half conquered. In a similar war in the year 1808, the French passed the Saal on the 9th of October, fought the battle of Jena on the 14th, entered Berlin on the 25th, and had taken all the citadels, and occupied the whole extent of the kingdom on the 8th of November. Nor was this a war in which Napoleon's big battalions won by sheer weight of numbers, as the Prussians have won battle after battle in this war. At Auerstadt, the most critical fight of the campaign, 27,000 French utterly defeated 51,000 Prussians. Much has been said of "thinking bayonets"—a formula by which it is meant to express the notion that a clerk, shopkeeper, or professional man, educated up to the German standard of civil life, makes a better soldier than a French peasant fresh from the rude life of

the fields, and whose mind has been formed on the religious and patriotic principles which are a traditional element of country life. But if it is good that a bayonet should think, obviously it is better that it should be able to think about its proper business; and it may be truly stated that the French soldier has never been deficient in the particular power of thinking out problems of war. There is no army in which the elements of the art of war are so well known by the common soldier; and it is the only army in which great generals have again and again risen from the ranks. If that army is in so very forlorn a state to-day, it is perhaps in some degree because it has been able, only too accurately, to realize with what want of skill and conduct it has been handled. On the other hand, if education has had anything to do with the Prussian success, it is possibly physical, not intellectual, education,—the Turner-verein, not the Lyceum,—which has enabled the men to march so well and to charge so stoutly. About the same time that the needle-gun was invented, gymnastics became a passion with the German youth, and the race may now, perhaps, be described as the nimblest in Europe—which is not exactly the character they would have got from contemporary travellers a century ago. Even fifteen years ago, however, in the time of the Crimean war, who could have imagined what tremendous elements of power lay latent in Prussia? Prussia was then regarded as a political satellite and commercial convenience for Russia, a country in whose public life liberty stagnated under forms, whose army was a mere militia little better than the Belgian, whose sovereign was a drunkard, and the heir to his crown a dullard, a bigot, and a martinet. Of the great ambition of its policy and of the great capacities of its people, of the tough activity of its marching men, and the accurate deadliness of their weapon, even neighbouring statesmen and soldiers knew no more than they knew, that the first political genius and the first military genius of the age were among its servants? Everything in the new imperial power has grown in a sort of "clear obscure" light, or like an edifice half hidden by its scaffolding. How did Austria, for example, remain blind to the revolution in military tactics which the invention of the needle-gun involved? Her officers had seen it employed against the Danes in 1849 and in 1865, and its results were recorded by many foreign spectators and by some Austrian soldiers; but they never realized the portentous efficacy of its fire until it swept down their own battalions as the scythe sweeps down corn-stalks. A new system of tactics had been invented, based upon the new weapon. This system was annually tested in a review of the Prussian army, not confined to enclosed camps like Chalons

or Aldershot, but carried on for many days in succession throughout, perhaps, a whole province of the kingdom, under conditions as closely as possible resembling those of actual war. A prince of the blood wrote a treatise to show how the new tactics would necessarily annihilate a French army. But the French army did not even deign to hear, to sneer, or to swear at the redoubtable Red Prince. Since the days of Tubal Cain, no State has had the services of such iron-masters as Herr Dreyse and Herr Krupp. But the great men who swayed the empires, whose very centre and sanctuary were to be the billet of their bullets, held them in light regard. Yet, when we come to consider the ultimate causes of things, it was Herr Dreyse who blew the Austrian Empire out of Germany; it was at a mere threat from the infernal lips of Herr Krupp's cannon that the French Empire succumbed at Sedan. In the summer of 1866, the hero-worshipping world, which had been for some years before vainly adjured by the High-priest of hero-worship to worship that unparalleled hybrid genius and villain, King Frederick the Second, suddenly learned that there was a real Prussian hero whose cerebellum contained the whole art and mystery of victory—a cold old hero, a man who wore spectacles and never smiled, who worked out a campaign by calculation in his closet on a black board, and destroyed an empire by means of a diagram so unerringly, that his adversary's ruin was never relieved even by the least gleam of success. He was merely a major at the age at which Wellington won the battle of Waterloo; and he never saw a great war until it fell to his lot, at the utter span of man's natural age, to direct the two greatest wars the world has seen since Waterloo; but, though unknown out of Prussia, faith in him was there so supreme that everything was willingly trusted to his inspiring volition and his rigidly harmonized combinations. Beside the great strategist, in battle after battle, rode the great statesman, insolent, impenetrable, imperturbable, more astute than Cavour, more dexterous than Palmerston, more deep than Napoleon, and with, besides, an atrocious audacity in action and a callous frankness of speech that are all his own. And before Bismarck and Moltke rode the king. Of King William it may be said that he, at present, appears to have given monarchy a new lease of life in Europe. In his seventy-third year he has gone through a great campaign in his saddle. He has known how to conduct himself, in all its emergencies, like a king and a knight. He has not been ashamed to thank God for victory. He has not been afraid to trust and honour the talents of his subjects. He has seen his son and nephew approve themselves valiant, active, and accomplished com-

manders. The princes of Germany have certainly shown that they understand the obligations of royalty in an age supposed to be inevitably gravitating towards democracy. Nor is it the least in the elements of strength which have given the Prussian power such transcendent scope and glory, that its blood royal can still be truly regarded by its subjects as a fountain of valour and policy, fit to flow in the veins of the kings of men.

Military scholars say that, in the course of the campaign of Waterloo, Napoleon the First wasted the forenoon of one day,—whether through somnolence, or indisposition, or sheer palsy of the jaded brain, was never known,—and that, on that morning, the last chance of saving the Empire was lost. At the commencement of his war with Prussia, Napoleon the Third lingered for ten days at Paris; and the occupation of those ten days, it is easy to predict, will yet be a perplexity to the historian. During those irreparable hours, all Germany was not merely mobilized, but marshalled in marching order. From the Baltic to the Tyrol, one great wave of war rolled steadily forward towards the French frontier. In the same period, it does not appear that any augmentation of the French army, ready to take the field, was attempted to be made, except by the withdrawal of the troops in garrison at Rome. The evacuation of Rome commenced on the same day that the battle of Wöerth was fought; and on that day the French army lost as many unwounded prisoners to the Prussians as the whole garrison of Rome counted rank and file. It may be doubted whether a single battalion of the Roman garrison arrived in time to fire a shot even at Sedan. In this fact, much is contained that is susceptible of other than a superstitious interpretation. The Emperor's position would be far from being so hopeless as it is, if a second garrison, like Bazaine's in Metz, only recognizing his authority, still guarded the sovereign independence of the Holy Father. Whether it is wiser policy on the part of a sovereign who governs such a country as France, and who hopes to establish a dynasty in it, to have the loyalty of the great, patient, tranquil, and orderly forces which move with the Church, or the sympathies of the lawless, noisy, ephemeral rabble who shout and stab in the name of the revolution, it ought not to need the assistance of a very exalted piety to pronounce. The Emperor governed France for ten years by the titles of Eldest Son of the Church, Saviour of Society, and Vanquisher of the Revolution. Towards the end of this period, he regarded the Revolution as so utterly suppressed, that in speaking to his Senators and Deputies, when opening the Session of 1857, of the late disastrous inundations, he said: "Je tiens à honneur qu'en France les fleuves comme la révolution rentrent dans leur lit, et qu'ils n'en puissent plus

sortir." Next year came the attempt of Orsini and the consequent change in the Emperor's Italian policy. For ten years more, he attempted to reconcile the irreconcilable, to call himself the Eldest Son of the Church, and to suborn, instigate, and protect its spoliators; to be reckoned Saviour of Society, and crowned accomplice of the Secret Societies; to carry to his account the moral authority of Rome and the corrosive energies of the Revolution; to build on the rock and unloose the flood at the same time. But this term, too, came to an end. At the commencement of the war with Germany, the Emperor had made up his mind finally to identify his authority in the minds of his people and of foreign nations with that power whose reduction he had formerly claimed to have so completely achieved. In his proclamation to the French people, announcing the war, on the 22nd of July, he used these ominous words: "Le glorieux drapeau que nous déployons encore une fois devant ceux qui nous provoquent est le même qui porta à travers l'Europe les idées civilisatrices de notre grande Révolution. Il représente les mêmes principes; il inspirera les mêmes dévouements." And so the crowned Jacobin went from his palace to his camp. All at once the patience of the Almighty seemed to be exhausted. The wise inspiration and good luck, which had sustained his sway so long, utterly deserted him. The men and the things upon which his authority rested, failed him. He failed himself. He foresaw nothing. He prevented nothing. He repaired nothing. "Unmerciful disaster followed fast and followed faster" on his track. His troops came to regard him as a dead weight on their movements. His ministers did not dare to name his name in the Chambers,—even Count Palikao did not shrink from suggesting that he had been excluded from all authority in the administration of the army. The great Empire, to which eight millions of men had lately testified their adhesion, did not seem to have a single subject left, who would, not to say, risk his life—but who would even utter one articulate word in its behalf. After Moscow, after Elba, after Waterloo, loyalty to the first Napoleon lived long in every French soldier's,—in almost every Frenchman's heart; and history will probably say that, on the whole, the third Napoleon did not deserve less well of his country. But, hardly had the first reverse befallen his army, when a universal panic and antipathy pervaded the whole nation; and when he was borne away to prison, all France seemed to feel, not that a great sovereign had fallen into the hands of his enemies, but that the nation had sent out a sort of scape-goat for its sin.

That the Revolution is a new religion is a statement for which Catholics are commonly condemned; and eminent English statesmen have gone to great pains to show that there are revolutions and revolutions, but no such moral essence, sectarian principle, or general organization of opinion as the Revolution. Anticipating such a line of argument very early in the development of that movement in France, Mr. Burke said, "The present revolution in France seems to me to be quite of another character and description; and to have little resemblance or analogy to any of those which have been brought about in Europe upon principles merely political. *It is a revolution of doctrine and theoretic dogma.* It has a much greater resemblance to those changes which have been made upon religious grounds, in which a spirit of proselytism makes an essential part;" and, from this point of view, Mr. Burke proceeds to compare it with "the last revolution of doctrine and opinion which has happened in Europe, the Reformation." The result of the one movement was Protestantism, the rejection of a considerable but varying portion of the Christian creed by a series of sects which persisted, nevertheless, in clinging to the Christian name, but who preserved only one point of common cohesion—opposition to the unity of the Christian Church. But the Revolution binds together a set of sects, bordering at one extreme upon doctrines as gross as Atheism, Thuggee, and Mormonism, at the other upon Masonry and Modern Liberalism. It is dissolving Protestantism by Indifferentism. The spirit of Voltaire supplants the spirit of Luther. Considering the relation of Voltaire to France, Prussia, and Almighty God, the erection of a statue to him is about the last occupation in which men of goodwill might expect to find Paris engaged when the news of the great disasters of the army burst upon it. But it so happened; and, after all, it is well that such an incident should occur, as an outward and visible sign of the state of the city upon which so terrible a judgment was impending. On Sunday, the 14th of August, the eve of the Feast of the Assumption, while the Germans were winning the battle of Courcelles, and already occupying Nancy—Paris, with the formal sanction of M. Chevreau, the new Minister of the Interior, proceeded to place a statue of Voltaire in the Square Monge; and a vast crowd, it is related, "saluted the statue with cries, a thousand times repeated, of '*Vive Voltaire.*'" It is impossible to resist the conviction that there was something prophetic in M. Voltaire's genius, as we consider word by word the following passages from his writings:—

Chaque peuple à son tour a régné sur la terre,
Par les lois, par les arts, et surtout par la guerre ;
Le siècle de la Prusse est à la fin venu.

And again, apostrophizing the Prussian power—

Quoi ! c'est donc cet heureux vainqueur
Et de l'Autriche et de la France !

And again, it is Paris which is addressed in solemn prose—

O Paris, sois digne, si tu peux, du vainqueur que tu recevras dans ton enceinte irrégulière et crottée.

The King of Prussia sent Voltaire his portrait in 1775. This is the fashion in which Voltaire acknowledged the gift. The term "Welche," it must be premised, is that which Voltaire commonly used when speaking of his countrymen, for whom he cherished an ineffable and unnatural contempt.

Il n'y point de Welche que ne tremble en voyant ce portrait-là. C'est précisément ce que je voulois—

Tout Welche qui vous examine,
De terreur est atteint,
Et chacun dit à votre mine
Que dans Rosbach on vous a peint.

Rosbach, the first great battle which Frederick won over the French. On another occasion he wrote of this Prussian victory—

Toutes les fois que j'écris à votre majesté sur une affaire un peu sérieuse, je tremble comme nos régiments à Rosbach.

Again—

Vous apprendrez aux Welches, à détester le fanatisme comme vous leur avez appris le métier de la guerre, si tant est qu'ils l'aient appris.

In fine—

L'uniforme prussien ne doit servir qu'à faire mettre à genoux les Welches.

The Emperor still reigned and the Empress Regent governed, and the new ultra-Imperialist ministry had just been constituted, and one of M. Chevreau's first acts, as Minister of the Interior, was to give his sanction to the placing of the Voltaire statue. That statue raised at such a moment is a monument. If the Prussians shall enter the city, they may well cover it with garlands and treat it as raised to celebrate their triumph. If every other work of human art and genius within the Boulevards should perish, and this alone escape the Prussian bomb, it would suffice to tell why God's wrath visited so terribly the scoffing sinful city. Had the Parisians, indeed, thought of Voltaire as the sycophant of Prussia, had they remembered the contempt with which he habitually spoke

of his own country in comparison, and how he, in anticipation, gloated over the thought of their defeat—Paris, with the Prussians at Nancy, would hardly have erected a statue to Voltaire. But Paris, even in its extremity, with idiotic magnanimity refused to think of Voltaire's glowing adulation of the conqueror, and his vile contempt of the Welches. Patriotic Paris, at such a moment, was so sublime as only to remember that Voltaire was the declared enemy of Almighty God. It was "to the great thinker, the grand philosopher" that Paris selected that supreme hour to do honour; and the world knows what was the quality of Voltaire's thinking, and whither his philosophy leads. A few days more, and Paris had erected another monument to Voltaire; that is to say, a Voltairian Government. Excepting General Trochu, a pious Breton, said to be a soldier pure and simple, who undertook the defence of Paris at the Emperor's order, and defends it, though the Empire is no more—the Government which Count Bismarck designated "the gentlemen of the pavement," would itself admit that it could be most conveniently and succinctly described as composed of disciples of Voltaire. The first act, for example, of the new Government was to release from prison and to instal, as Minister of Barricades, M. Henri Rochefort. Having read more than enough of M. Rochefort's lucubrations, we presume to say that the quality of his heart and soul, not to speak of his intellect and his intelligence, are perhaps most perfectly expressed in certain lines which he has written àpropos of M. Renan's "Vie de Jésus," and of which lines the object is to complain that M. Renan has made the character of Our Lord too interesting. It is with some hesitation that we reprint these lines; but we dare to regard them as in some sense evidence for a judgment of God. Like the Voltaire statue, they are a salient illustration of the moral state of Paris in 1870; and of Paris M. Rochefort has been in its latter days the chosen type and idol—the man, whom of all men Paris most delighted to honour.

Je suis d'ailleurs plus malin que Voltaire.
A tout hasard, s'il est en paradis
Pour demeurer bien avec Dieu le père
En pension j'ai pris monsieur son fils.

Des dieux mal mis nous n'avons plus le culte,
Nous ne voulons que des dieux élégants,
Et pour qu'il ne parût pas trop inculte,
A Jésus Christ j'ai prêté mes vieux gants.

A bout du temps de son apprentissage,
En nous quittant nous nous embrasserons,
Il m'est venu simple dieu du village,
J'en aurai fait le Jésus des salons! *

Here then is the case of a country in which a man who is only famous for writing profanities of the grossest character, varied by revolting political personalities, is, in the moment of national disasters and humiliations, taken out of prison and set at the head of a department of State. After reading the lines which we have quoted, one is irresistibly tempted to compare such an incident to the incident of Barrabas. But the comparison is hardly adequate; for, after all, the Jews did not ask Pontius Pilate to set up Barrabas in Herod's seat. And this is not an exception, but a symptom. There is no moral force in France adequate to make an audible protest against such acts. Wherever throughout the vast expanse of that ancient, pious, and glorious land, whose hills bear the names of Saints, whose cities rose at the bidding of Bishops, whose wastes were first colonised by monks, whose name was the most Christian, which loved Our Lady, and which Notre Dame de France loved—and loves so well: wherever, we say, the officials and supporters of this Government are not actually obliged to take the field against the Prussians, they proceed, as at Lyons, to impress or imprison priests and to hunt nuns. They accumulate already the elements of religious persecution and civil war. Over every frontier, old and young go into exile, not so much from the Prussians as from the Reds. It is an hour in which wickedness is supreme. The scenes which pass daily blend together the most ghastly tragedy and the most grotesque effects of caricature. Ridicule and agony mingle, as we contemplate Rochefort haled on the shoulders of the mob from a cell in Saint Pélagie to the Louvre; Jules Favre bounding and sobbing under the grim gaze of Bismarck; and Gambetta descending from a balloon to embrace Garibaldi in his red shirt. Witnessing such inconceivable scenes, in which all that is terrible and all that is burlesque combine their strongest effects, who shall dare to foretell when it may please God to stay the chastisement of a people, once so dear to Him, girded by Him for such heroic deeds, and inspired by Him with such world-resounding words.

It is no wonder that in such a time the minds of men turn from the portents which surround them, of which the issues baffle calculation, to predictions and revelations, at which, in ordinary days, it is their habit to scoff. So in French journals, not remarkable for their piety—and now even in English organs of opinion, such predictions as those of Orval, of Blois, and of S. Malachy are curiously, and not altogether disrespectfully, scrutinized. The authenticity of some of them is doubted by

* We quote from Mr. Blanchard Jerrold's admirable letters, collected as "The Gavroche Party," (Hotten), a book that will be among the most valuable of the materials of the history of the Second Empire.

good authority; that no special sanction of the Church attaches to any of them need hardly be said. But certain it is that they have not been invented for the occasion; and that they suggest, at least, some curious coincidences with current events. There is an edition of the prophecy of S. Malachy to be seen in the library of the British Museum, which was printed two hundred years ago. The prophecy of Lehninn has, we believe, been known to German scholars for upwards of a century. The prophecy of Orval, whose authenticity is much questioned, was, at all events, printed in the *Journal des Villes et Campagnes*, a well-known Paris paper, so long ago as 1839. The third edition of a collection of such documents, entitled *Révelations sur l'Eglise et la Révolution*, was published by Goemare, of Brussels, in 1860, and was translated into English shortly afterwards by Mr. Henry Langdon. Such of these predictions as refer especially to French affairs all concur in presenting the vision of a terrible war on the soil of France, and especially a scene of fearful carnage and destruction at Paris. The prophecy of Blois speaks of this period as one in which "on fera partir tous les hommes, il ne restera que les veillards;" and then: "on ne saura les nouvelles au vrai, que par quelques lettres particulières." And then, it is said, will follow a time in which the news will be carried through Blois to Tours by couriers, one of whom will at last carry "la bonne nouvelle;" upon which will follow a great reign.

Mais ce ne sera pas celui qu'on croit qui règnera, qui règnera d'abord; ce sera le sauveur accordi à la France, sur lequel la France ne comptait pas.

Another of these predictions fixes the period of France's great trial at three months; but they all seem to agree in the expectation that terrible ruin will befall Paris; and that an almost miraculous interposition, like that of Joan of Arc, will ultimately and suddenly relieve the country. The German prophecy of Lehninn specially concerns the House of Hohenzollern. It speaks of the present time as one in which, amid wonderful vicissitudes of fortune, a new power will arise in Germany; but that the prince who holds the sceptre will be the last of his race. It points, in the next verse, to some great crime committed in Israel—a crime execrable and worthy of death; but concludes with the line:—

The pastor recovers his flock, and Germany obtains a King.

Many such predictions, notably that attributed to Saint Hildegarde, speak of what has happened at Rome, of grievous indignities inflicted on the Pope, and of the reduction of his civil principality to a small corner of the city. But at this point we pass out of the mystic and uncertain air of prophecy, without authority, to the clear and confident words of autho-

rity itself. The Catholic Church is supposed to have received a great blow in the fall of what is commonly called "the Temporal Power of the Pope." Its first effect, many Protestants even believe, will be destructive to the whole theory of Infallibility. Its first effect in that regard will, on the contrary, we believe, be to remove any lingering doubt that may have remained in the mind of any Catholic as to the opportuneness of the definition uttered by the Council ere it broke up on the eve of the declaration of war. In the state into which the world has since drifted, and is still drifting, it is surely well that there should not be the shadow of the shade of a doubt possible within the confines of the Church, as to the exact character of the Supreme Pontiff's authority. As to invasion of his states, it is a mere matter of fact, that nothing has happened at Rome but what the Holy Father precisely anticipated four years ago, when the Emperor Napoleon was at the height of his power, and M. Rouher had not yet uttered his famous *jamais!* "As I have already said to others of your comrades,"—so spoke the Pope to the French general and garrison in December, 1866, "we must not delude ourselves; the Revolution will come hither. It has said so and proclaimed it; you have heard it, understood it, seen it. Words have been placed in the mouth of a great personage that *Italy is made, but not yet completed.* I, in my turn, will say that if she is not yet completely undone, if she exists as she does, it is because there is still a fragment of the earth where I am, in which justice, order, and peace reign. When that shall no more be so, I see the flag of the Revolution float over the Capitol; but I see also that the Tarpeian Rock is not far off." And now it has come to pass. The flag of the Revolution floats over the Capitol. The Revolution has seized Rome, in violation of "the common law of nations," in defiance of "the text of treaties," by "a violent and immediate invasion," by an act of "violent and bloody conquest," in contradiction to the "declared policy" of the Government of Florence, in a way that places it "in antagonism with the public opinion of the whole of Europe." The epithets which we quote are those, it may be supposed, of some vehement partisan of the Papal authority, or are culled from an official protest of Cardinal-Antonelli. By no means. They are the words of Signor Visconti Venosta, Minister of Foreign Affairs, spoken in the Chamber of Deputies at Florence, exactly a month before the invasion of the Pontifical territory was commenced. On the 19th of August this Minister declared that even if the Convention of September of 1864 were not in existence, and the Italian Government had re-accepted it at the end of July, 1870, the Roman States

were entitled to be respected in virtue of the common law of nations. On the 24th of August the same Minister made a still more formal and categorical statement. He said:—

The honourable gentleman (Giotto-Pinta) asks me if I am prepared to transfer to Rome the Department of Foreign Affairs. I ask him in reply, is he prepared to advise such a course? Is he prepared to go there with a violent and immediate invasion; is he prepared to solve the Roman question by taking action of a decisive character forthwith; action perhaps involving violent and bloody conquest? I may tell the hon. Deputy that such a course must have at least two very serious inconveniences; it is in contradiction to our declared policy, and it places us in antagonism with the public opinion of the whole of Europe. There is no one, I am sure, in this House who is prepared to urge such a course upon the Government. The difficulties with which the Roman question is beset are real, and inseparable from it; the concurrence of many conditions is needed to ensure a success that shall be lasting; we must not commit the country to a policy of chance—a policy subject to events which we are unable to direct or to foresee.

This speech, as we have said, was spoken exactly a month before the Italian army marched on Rome; and in it the Government of King Victor Emmanuel has characterized its own conduct in terms to which we have no occasion to add. It entered Rome by action involving violent and bloody conquest, in violation of treaties, in defiance of the law of nations. But Signor Visconti-Venosta was wrong in anticipating the antagonism of the public opinion of the whole of Europe. Public opinion, in England at least, had utterly exhausted its spare supply of moral indignation in denouncing the similar but not so utterly treacherous enterprise contemplated by the Emperor Napoleon and Count Bismarck in regard to the territory of the King of the Belgians. What happened at Rome was applauded at once and ever since—from the breach beside the Villa Bonaparte to the ballot-box presented at the point of the bayonet. But the end is not yet. "I repeat," said the Holy Father, in the speech we have quoted above, "the thing may come to pass. I am weak. I have no resource upon earth. Notwithstanding, I am tranquil, because I trust in a Power which will give me the strength of which I stand in need. That Power is God." The Italian Government has adopted a policy which they had described beforehand "as a policy of chance, a policy subject to events which they are unable to direct or to foresee." They have, according to their own confession, violated human and divine law, in order to plunder and imprison him whom they know to be the Vicar of Christ. They have now to deal with the Author and Master of "events." They are at the Capitol. At the Tarpeian rock they will arrive in the just God's good time.

CONSTITUTIO DOGMATICA PRIMA DE ECCLESIA CHRISTI.

PIUS EPISCOPUS, SERVUS SERVORUM DEI, SACRO APPROBANTE CONCILIO, AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM.

Pastor æternus et episcopus animarum nostrarum, ut salutiferum redemptionis opus perenne redderet, sanctam ædificare Ecclesiam decrevit, in quâ veluti in domo Dei viventis fideles omnes unius fidei et charitatis vinculo continerentur. Quapropter, priusquam clarificaretur, rogavit Patrem non pro Apostolis tantum, sed et pro eis, qui credituri erant per verbum eorum in ipsum, ut omnes unum essent, sicut ipse Filius et Pater unum sunt. Quemadmodum igitur Apostolos, quos sibi de mundo elegerat, misit, sicut ipse missus erat a Patre: ita in Ecclesiâ suâ Pastores et Doctores usque ad consummationem sæculi esse voluit. Ut vero episcopatus ipse unus et indivisus esset, et per cohærentes sibi invicem sacerdotes credentium multitudo universa in fidei et communionis unitate conservaretur, beatum Petrum cæteris Apostolis præponens, in ipso instituit perpetuum utriusque unitatis principium ac visibile fundamentum, super cujus fortitudinem æternum exstrueretur templum, et Ecclesiæ cœlo inferenda sublimitas in hujus fidei firmitate consurgeret.* Et quoniam portæ inferi ad evertendam, si fieri posset, Ecclesiam contra ejus fundamentum divinitùs positum majori in dies odio undique insurgunt; Nos ad catholici gregis custodiam, incolumitatem, augmentum, necessarium esse judicamus, sacro approbante Concilio, doctrinam de institutione, perpetuitate, ac naturâ sacri Apostolici primatûs, in quo totius Ecclesiæ vis ac soliditas consistit, cunctis fidelibus credendam et tenendam, secundum antiquam atque constantem universalis Ecclesiæ fidem, proponere atque contrarios, dominico gregi adeo perniciosos, errores proscribere et condemnare.

CAPUT I.

DE APOSTOLICI PRIMATUS IN BEATO PETRO INSTITUTIONE.

Docemus itaque et declaramus, juxta Evangelii testimonia primatum jurisdictionis in universam Dei Ecclesiam immediate et directe beato Petro Apostolo promissum atque collatum a Christo Domino fuisse. Unum enim Simonem, cui jampridem dixerat: "Tu vocaberis Cephas," † postquam ille suam edidit confessionem inquiens: "Tu es Christus, Filius Dei vivi," solemnibus hi verbis allocutus est Dominus: "Beatus es Simon Bar-Jona: quia caro et sanguis non revelavit tibi, sed Pater meus, qui in cœlis est: et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, et portæ inferi non prævalebunt adversus eam: et tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum: et

* S. Leo. M. Serm. IV. (al. III.), cap. ii., in diem Natalis sui.
† Joan. i. 42.

FIRST DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF GOD.

PIUS, BISHOP, SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD, ... SACRO APPROBANTE CONCILIO, ... FOR PERPETUAL REMEMBRANCE.

THE Eternal Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, in order to make perpetual the salutary work of redemption, resolved to build up Holy Church, that in her, as in the house of the living God, all the faithful might be contained in the bond of one faith and charity. Wherefore, before He was glorified, He asked His Father, not only for the Apostles, but also for those who were to believe in Him through their word, that they might all be one as the Son Himself and the Father are one. (John xvii. 1-20, &c.) And even as He sent the Apostles, whom He had chosen for Himself out of the world, as He Himself had been sent by His Father; even so He willed that that there should be pastors and doctors in His Church until the consummation of the world. But in order that the Episcopacy itself should be one and undivided, and that the universal multitude of believers should be preserved in unity of faith and of communion by priests mutually cohering among themselves, He placed Blessed Peter above the other Apostles, and instituted in him the perpetual principle and visible foundation of this twofold unity, that on his fortitude the eternal temple should be built, and that on the firmness of his faith the sublimity of the Church should rise and reach to heaven. (S. Leo M., Serm. IV. (al. III.) cap. 2, in diem Natalis sui.) And since the gates of hell, in order to destroy, were that possible, the Church, rise everywhere with daily increasing hate against her divinely-established foundation, we, *Sacro approbante Concilio*, judge it necessary for the custody, safety, and increase of the Catholic Flock, to set forth, according to the ancient and constant belief of the Universal Church, the doctrine to be believed and held by all the Faithful, concerning the institution, perpetuity, and nature of the sacred Apostolic primacy, in which consists the force and solidity of the whole Church, and to proscribe and to condemn contrary errors so pernicious to the Lord's Flock.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE INSTITUTION OF THE APOSTOLIC PRIMACY IN BLESSED PETER.

We teach, therefore, and declare, in accordance with the testimony of the Gospel, that the primacy of jurisdiction over the Universal Church of God was, by Christ our Lord, immediately and directly promised to, and conferred upon, Blessed Peter the Apostle. For to Simon alone, to whom He had said: "Thou shalt be called Cephas" (John i. 42), after the other had uttered his confession: "Thou art Christ, Son of the living God," did our Lord say: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood have

quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in cœlis: et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in cœlis." * Atque uni Simoni Petro contulit Jesus post suam resurrectionem summi pastoris et rectoris jurisdictionem in totum suum ovile, dicens: "Pasce agnos meos; Pasce oves meas." † Huic tam manifestæ sacrarum Scripturarum doctrinæ, ut ab Ecclesiâ catholicâ semper intellecta est, aperte opponuntur pravæ eorum sententiæ, qui constitutam a Christo Domino in suâ Ecclesiâ regiminis formam pervertentes, negant solum Petrum præ cæteris Apostolis, sive seorsum singulis, sive omnibus simul, vero proprioque jurisdictionis primatu fuisse a Christo instructum; aut qui affirmant eumdem primatum non immediate, directeque ipsi beato Petro, sed Ecclesiæ, et per hanc illi ut ipsius Ecclesiæ ministro dēlatum fuisse.

Si quis igitur dixerit, beatum Petrum Apostolum non esse a Christo Domino constitutum Apostolorum omnium principem et totius Ecclesiæ militantis visibile caput; vel eumdem honoris tantum, non autem veræ propriæque jurisdictionis primatum ab eodem Domino nostro Jesu Christo directe et immediate accepisse; anathema sit.

CAPUT II.

DE PERPETUITATE PRIMATUS B. PETRI IN ROMANIS PONTIFICIBUS.

Quod autem in beato Apostolo Petro, princeps pastorum et pastor magnus ovium Dominus Christus Jesus in perpetuam salutem ac perenne bonum Ecclesiæ instituit, id eodem auctore in Ecclesiâ, quæ fundata super petram ad finem sæculorum usque firma stabit, jugiter durare necesse est. Nulli sane dubium, imo sæculis omnibus notum est, quod sanctus beatissimusque Petrus, Apostolorum princeps et caput, fideique columna et Ecclesiæ catholicæ fundamentum, a Domino nostro Jesu Christo, Salvatore humani generis ac Redemptore, claves regni accepit: qui ad hoc usque tempus et semper in suis successoribus, episcopis sanctæ Romanæ Sedis, ab ipso fundatæ, ejusque consecratæ sanguine, vivit et præsidet et judicium exercet.‡ Unde quicumque in hâc Cathedrâ Petro succedit, is secundum Christi ipsius institutionem primatum Petri in universam Ecclesiam obtinet. Manet ergo dispositio veritatis, et beatus Petrus in acceptâ fortitudine petræ perseverans suscepta Ecclesiæ gubernacula non reliquit.|| Hâc de causâ ad Romanam Ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse semper fuit omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos, qui sunt undique fideles, ut in eâ Sede, e quâ venerandæ communionis jura in omnes dimanant, tanquam membra in capite consociata, in unam corporis compagem coalescerent.§

Si quis ergo dixerit, non esse ex ipsius Christi Domini institutione, seu jure divino, ut beatus Petrus in primatu super universam Ecclesiam habeat

---

* Matth. xvi. 46–49. † Joan. xxi. 45–47.

‡ Cf. Ephesini Concilii Act. III.

|| S. Leo. M. Serm. III. (al. II.), cap. iii.

§ S. Irenæ *Adv. Hær.*, l. iii. c. iii., et Ep. Concil. Aquil. a. 384 ad Gratian. Imper., c. iv. Cf. Pius VI. Breve *Super Soliditate.*

not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven. (Matthew xvi. 16–19.) And upon Simon Peter only, did Jesus, after His resurrection, confer the jurisdiction of Chief Pastor and Ruler over His whole flock, saying: "Feed My lambs. Feed My sheep." (John xxi. 45–47.) To this so manifest teaching of Holy Writ, as it hath been always understood by the Catholic Church, are openly opposed the wrongful opinions of those who, perverting the form of government constituted by Christ in His Church, deny that Peter alone, in preference to the other Apostles, whether to each separately or to all collectively, was endowed by Christ with a true and proper primacy of jurisdiction, or who affirm that this primacy was transmitted not immediately and directly to Blessed Peter, but to the Church, and through it to him as a minister of that Church.

If, then, any shall say that Blessed Peter, the Apostle, was not constituted by Christ our Lord, Prince of all the Apostles, and visible Head of the whole Church militant; or that he received, directly and immediately from our Lord Jesus Christ, a primacy of honour only, and not of true and proper jurisdiction, let him be anathema.

CHAPTER II.

OF THE PERPETUITY OF THE PRIMACY OF PETER IN THE ROMAN PONTIFF.

That which the Prince of Pastors, and the great Pastor of the Sheep, our Lord Jesus Christ, established in the person of blessed Peter, the Apostle, for the perpetual safety and perennial good of the Church, must of necessity, by His agony, constantly continue in the Church, which, being founded on a rock, will stand firm until the end of time. It is doubtful to none, it is notorious in every age, that the holy and blessed Peter, Prince and chief of the Apostles, the pillar of the Faith, and the foundation of the Catholic Church, who received the keys of the kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, lives, presides, and judges till now, and always in his successors, the Bishops of the Holy Roman See, which was founded by him, and consecrated by his blood. (Council of Ephesus, art. iii. S. Peter Chrysologus' Letter to Eutyches, priest.) Hence, whoever succeeds to Peter in this Chair, he, by the institution of Christ Himself, obtains the primacy of Peter over the Universal Church. There endures, therefore, still the institution of the truth, and blessed Peter persevering in the strength of the rock imparted to him, hath not abandoned the government of the Church undertaken by him. (S. Leo the Great, Serm. III. (al. II.) c. 3.) For this reason it was always necessary that every Church, that is to say, the Faithful everywhere, should be in union with the Roman Church on account of its more excellent principality, in order that in this See, whence the rights of venerable communion are diffused to all, they may coalesce in

perpetuos successores ; aut Romanum Pontificem non esse beati Petri in eodem primatu successorem ; anathema sit.

CAPUT III.

DE VI ET RATIONE PRIMATUS ROMANI PONTIFICIS.

Quapropter apertis innixi sacrarum litterarum testimoniis et inhærentes tum Prædecessorum Nostrorum Romanorum Pontificum, tum Conciliorum generalium disertis, perspicuisque decretis, innovamus œcumenici Concilii Florentini definitionem, quâ credendum ab omnibus Christi fidelibus est, sanctam Apostolicam Sedem, et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum, et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri principis Apostolorum, et verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiæ caput, et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere ; et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi et gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse ; quemadmodum etiam in gestis œcumenicorum Conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur.

Docemus proinde et declaramus, Ecclesiam Romanam disponente Domino super omnes alias ordinariæ potestatis obtinere principatum, et hanc Romani Pontificis jurisdictionis potestatem, quæ vere episcopalis est, immediatam esse ; erga quam cujuscumque ritûs et dignitatis, pastores atque fideles, tam seorsum singuli quam simul omnes, officio hierarchicæ subordinationis, veræque obedientiæ obstringuntur, non solum in rebus, quæ ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quæ ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ, per totum orbem diffusæ, pertinent ; ita ut custodita cum Romano Pontifice tam communionis, quam ejusdem fidei professionis unitate, Ecclesia Christi sit unus grex sub uno Summo Pastore. Hæc est catholicæ veritatis doctrina, a quâ deviare salvâ fide atque salute nemo potest.

Tantum autem abest, ut hæc Summi Pontificis potestas officiat ordinariæ ac immediatæ illi episcopalis jurisdictionis potestati quâ Episcopi, qui positi a Spiritu Sancto in Apostolorum locum successerunt, tanquam veri Pastores assignatos sibi greges, singuli singulos, pascunt et regunt, ut eadem a supremo et universali Pastore asseratur, roboretur ac vindicetur, secundum illud sancti Gregorii Magni : "Meus honor est honor universalis Ecclesiæ. Meus honor est fratrum meorum solidus vigor. Tum ego vere honoratus sum, cum singulis quibusque honor debitus non negatur."*

Porro ex supremâ illâ Romani Pontificis potestate gubernandi universam Ecclesiam jus eidem esse consequitur, in hujus sui muneris exercitio libere communicandi cum pastoribus et gregibus totius Ecclesiæ, ut iidem ab ipso in viâ salutis doceri ac regi possint. Quare damnamus ac reprobamus illorum sententias, qui hanc supremi capitis cum pastoribus et gregibus communicationem licite impediri posse dicunt, aut eandem reddunt sæculari potestati obnoxiam, ita ut contendant, quæ ab Apostolicâ Sede vel ejus auctoritate ad regimen Ecclesiæ constituuntur, vim ac valorem non habere, nisi potestatis sæcularis placito confirmentur.

---

* S. Greg. M. ad Eulog. Alexandrin., l. viii, ep. xxx,

one frame of body, like limbs whose fellowship is in the head. (S. Irenæus—Council of Aquileia. Pius VII., Brief *Super Soliditate.*)

If any, therefore, shall say that it is not of the institution of Christ our Lord, Himself, or of divine right, that Blessed Peter has perpetual successors in the primacy over the Universal Church ; or that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of Blessed Peter in that primacy, let him be anathema.

CHAPTER III.

OF THE NATURE AND CHARACTER OF THE PRIMACY OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF.

Wherefore, relying on the clear testimony of Holy Writ, and adhering to the formal and clear decrees both of our predecessors, the Roman Pontiffs, and of General Councils, we renew the definition of the Œcumenical Council of Florence, by which all the Faithful of Christ are bound to believe that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff have the primacy over the whole world ; and that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter the Apostle, and the true Vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians ; and that to him, in Blessed Peter, full power was given by our Lord Jesus Christ to feed, rule, and govern the Universal Church, as is contained also in the acts of Œcumenical Councils, and in the sacred Canons.

Next, we teach and declare that the Roman Church, by the design of God, has the supremacy of ordinary power over all others, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate ; and that pastors and faithful of every rite and rank, whether singly and separately, or collectively, are bound to it by the duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in things which pertain to the discipline and rule of the Church spread over the whole world, so that by preserving unity of communion, and of the profession of the same faith with the Roman Pontiff, the Church of Christ is one flock under one Chief Pastor. This is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without injury to faith and to salvation.

But that ordinary and immediate power of episcopal jurisdiction, with which the bishops who, placed by the Holy Ghost, have succeeded the Apostles (Council of Trent), rule and govern like true Pastors each the particular flock assigned to him, is so far from being hindered by this power of the Supreme Pontiff, that it is asserted, strengthened, and vindicated by the supreme and universal pastor, according to the words of S. Gregory the Great : " My honour is the honour of the Universal Church. My honour is the solid strength of my brothers. I am truly honoured when the honour due to each is not denied." (S. Gregory, ep. xxx.)

Further, from this supreme power of the Roman Pontiff of governing the Universal Church, it follows that he has the right of communicating freely with the pastors and flocks of the whole Church in the exercise of this his office, that so they may be taught and ruled by him in the way of salvation.

Et quoniam divino Apostolici primatûs jure Romanus Pontifex universæ Ecclesiæ præest, docemus etiam et declaramus, eum esse judicem supremum fidelium,* et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus, ad ipsius posse judicium recurri ;† Sedis vero Apostolicæ, cujus auctoritate major non est, judicium a nemine fore retractandum, neque cuiquam de ejus licere judicare judicio.‡ Quare a recto veritatis tramite aberrant, qui affirmant licere ab judiciis Romanorum Pontificum ad œcumenicum Concilium tanquam ad auctoritatem Romano Pontifici superiorem appellare.

Si quis itaque dixerit, Romanum Pontificem habere tantummodo officium inspectionis vel directionis, non autem plenam et supremam potestatem jurisdictionis in universam Ecclesiam, non solum in rebus, quæ ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis quæ ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ per totum orbem diffusæ pertinent ; aut eum habere tantum potiores partes, non vero totam plenitudinem hujus supremæ potestatis ; aut hanc ejus potestatem non esse ordinariam et immediatam, sive in omnes ac singulas ecclesias, sive in omnes et singulos pastores et fideles ; anathema sit.

CAPUT IV.

DE ROMANI PONTIFICIS INFALLIBILI MAGISTERIO.

Ipso autem Apostolico primatu, quem Romanus Pontifex tanquam Petri principis Apostolorum successor in universam Ecclesiam obtinet, supremam quoque magisterii potestatem comprehendi, hæc Sancta Sedes semper tenuit, perpetuus Ecclesiæ usus comprobat, ipsaque œcumenica Concilia, ea imprimis, in quibus Orienscum Occidente in fidei charitatisque unionem conveniebat, declaraverunt. Patres enim Concilii Constantinopolitani quarti, majorum vestigiis inhærentes, hanc solemnem ediderunt professionem : "Prima salus est, rectæ fidei regulam custodire. Et quia non potest Domini nostri Jesu Christi prætermitti sententia dicentis : 'Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam,' hæc, quæ dicta sunt, rerum probantur effectibus, quia in Sede Apostolicâ immaculata est semper catholica reservata religio, et sancta celebrata doctrina. Ab hujus ergo fide et doctrinâ separari minime cupientes, speramus, ut in unâ communione, quam Sedes Apostolica prædicat, esse mereamur, in quâ est integra et vera Christianæ religionis soliditas."§ Approbante vero Lugdunensi Concilio secundo, Græci professi sunt : "Sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam summum et plenum primatum et principatum super universam Ecclesiam catholicam obtinere, quem se ab ipse Domino in beatoPetro Apostolorum principe sive vertice, cujus Romanus Pontifex est successor, cum potestatis plenitudine recepisse veraciter et humiliter recognoscit ; et sicut præ cæteris tenetur fidei veritatem defendere, sic et, si quæ de fide subortæ fuerint quæstiones, suo debent judicio definiri." Florentinum denique

---

* Pius VI. Breve *Super Solidit.*
† Concil. Œcum. Lugd. II.
‡ Ep. Nicolai I. ad Michaelem Imperatorem.
§ Ex Formulâ Hormisdæ Papæ.

Wherefore we condemn and reprobate the opinions of those who say that this communication of the Supreme Head with the pastors and flocks may be lawfully impeded, or who make it dependent on the secular power, so as to contend that things appointed for the government of the Church by the Apostolic See, or by its authority, have no force or value, unless they be confirmed by the *Placet* of the secular power.

And since, by the divine right of the Apostolic Primacy, the Roman Pontiff presides over the Universal Church, we also teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the Faithful (Pius VI., Brief *Super Soliditate*), and that in all causes which are of ecclesiastical cognizance (Second Œcumenical Council of Lyons), recourse may be had to his judgment ; that the judgment of the Apostolic See, whose authority has no superior, can be reviewed by none ; and that no one is allowed to judge its judgments. (Letter of Nicholas I. to the Emperor Michael.) Those, therefore, stray from the straight way of truth who affirm that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman Pontiffs to an Œcumenical Council as to an authority superior to the Roman Pontiff.

If, then, any shall say that the Roman Pontiff has only an office of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the Universal Church, not only in things which relate to faith and morals, but also in things which relate to the discipline and government of the Church spread over the whole world, or that he has only the principal part and not the whole plenitude of this supreme power; or that this, his power, is not ordinary and immediate, both over all and singular the Churches, and over all and singular the pastors and Faithful, let him be anathema.

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE INFALLIBLE MAGISTERIUM OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF.

That the supreme power of the *magisterium* is also contained in the Apostolic Primacy, which the Roman Pontiff, as successor of Peter the Prince of Apostles, possesses over the Universal Church, has always been held by this Holy See, is proved by the perpetual use of the Church, and has been declared by Œcumenical Councils themselves, and by those especially in which the East agreed with the West in the union of faith and charity. So the fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following the footsteps of their predecessors, put forth the solemn profession : " The first condition of safety is to keep the rule of right faith, and because it is impossible that the sentence of Our Lord Jesus Christ should be set aside, who said : ' Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church ' (Matthew xvi. 18), these words are verified by facts, for in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion has always been preserved immaculate, and holy doctrine has always been proclaimed. Desiring, therefore, never to be separated from its faith and doctrine, we hope that we may deserve to be in the one communion which the Apostolic See proclaims, in which is the whole and true solidity of the Christian religion." (From the formula of Pope S. Hormisdas, as proposed by Adrian II., and subscribed by the fathers of the Eighth Œcumenical Council, the fourth of

Concilium definivit: "Pontificem Romanum, verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiæ caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi ac gubernandi universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse."

Huic pastorali muneri ut satisfacerent, Prædecessores Nostri indefessam semper operam dederunt, ut salutaris Christi doctrina apud omnes terræ populos propagaretur, parique curâ vigilarunt, ut, ubi recepta esset, sincera et pura conservaretur. Quocirca totius orbis Antistites nunc singuli, nunc in Synodis congregati, longam Ecclesiarum consuetudinem et antiquæ regulæ formam sequentes, ea præsertim pericula, quæ in negotiis fidei emergebant, ad hanc Sedem Apostolicam retulerunt, ut ibi potissimum resarcirentur damna fidei, ubi fides non potest sentire defectum.* Romani autem Pontifices, prout temporum et rerum conditio suadebat, nunc convocatis œcumenicis Conciliis aut exploratâ Ecclesiæ per orbem dispersæ sententiâ, nunc per Synodos particulares, nunc aliis, quæ divina suppeditabat providentia, adhibitis auxiliis, ea tenenda definiverunt, quæ sacris Scripturis et apostolicis Traditionibus consentanea Deo adjutore cognoverant. Neque enim Petri successoribus Spiritus Sanctus promissus est, ut eo revelante novam doctrinam patefacerent, sed ut eo assistente traditam per Apostolos revelationem seu fidei depositum sancte custodirent et fideliter exponerent. Quorum quidem apostolicam doctrinam omnes venerabiles Patres amplexi et sancti Doctores orthodoxi venerati atque secuti sunt; plenissime scientes, hanc sancti Petri Sedem ab omni semper errore illibatam permanere, secundum Domini Salvatoris nostri divinam pollicitationem discipulorum suorum principi factam: "Ego rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat fides tua, et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos."

Hoc igitur veritatis et fidei nunquam deficientis charisma Petro ejusque in hâc Cathedrâ successoribus divinitùs collatum est, ut excelso suo munere in omnium salutem fungerentur, ut universus Christi grex per eos ab erroris venenosâ escâ aversus, cœlestis doctrinæ pabulo nutriretur, ut, sublatâ schismatis occasione, Ecclesia tota una conservaretur atque suo fundamento innixa firma adversus inferi portas consisteret.

At vero, cum hâc ipsâ ætate, quâ salutifera Apostolici muneris efficacia vel maxime requiritur, non pauci inveniantur, qui illius auctoritati obtrectant; necessarium omnino esse censemus, prærogativam, quam unigenitus Dei Filius cum summo pastorali officio conjungere dignatus est, solemniter asserere.

Itaque Nos traditioni a fidei Christianæ exordio perceptæ fideliter inhærendo, ad Dei Salvatoris nostri gloriam, religionis catholicæ exaltationem et Christianorum populorum salutem, sacro approbante Concilio, docemus et divinitùs revelatum dogma esse definimus: Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedrâ loquitur, id est, cum omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens, pro supremâ suâ Apostolicâ auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universâ Ecclesiâ tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, eâ infallibilitate pollere, quâ divinus Re-

* Cf. S. Bern., ep. 190.

Constantinople.) And the Greeks professed with the approbation of the Second Council of Lyons: that the Holy Roman Church possesses the supreme and full primacy and sovereignty over the Universal Catholic Church, which it truly and humbly acknowledges itself to have received with plenitude of power from our Lord Himself in Blessed Peter, the Prince or Chief of the Apostles, of whom the Roman Pontiff is the successor; and as he, beyond all others, is bound to defend the truth of the faith, so also, if any questions concerning the faith shall arise, they ought to be defined by his judgment. Lastly, the Council of Florence defined: that the Roman Pontiff is the true Vicar of Christ and the head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians; and that to him, in Blessed Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ full power to feed, rule, and govern the Universal Church. (*See* John xxi. 15–17.)

To fulfil this pastoral duty, our predecessors have laboured unweariedly that the salutary teaching of Christ should be propagated among all the nations of the earth, and have watched with like care that when it had been received it should be preserved pure and uncorrupted. Wherefore the Bishops of the whole world, now singly and now assembled in Synod, following a long custom of the Church (S. Cyril of Alexandria to Pope S. Celestine), and the form of the ancient rule (S. Innocent I. to the Council of Carthage), have reported to the Apostolic See such dangers as emerged especially in matters of faith, that the injuries done to the faith might be repaired in that quarter where the faith can experience no failure. (*See* S. Bernard, epist. 190.) And the Roman Pontiffs, as time and circumstance required, either by convening Œcumenical Councils, or by consulting the Church spread over the world, or by local synods, or by other helps supplied by Divine Providence, have defined that those things should be held which they knew, by the help of God, to be in accordance with Holy Writ and Apostolic tradition. For the Holy Spirit did not promise the successors of Peter to reveal to them new doctrine for them to publish, but to assist them to keep holily and expound faithfully the revelation handed down through the Apostles, *i.e.* the Deposit of Faith. Their Apostolic doctrine has been embraced by all the Venerable Fathers, and has been revered and followed by all the holy orthodox doctors, knowing well that this See of S. Peter remains always exempt from all error, according to the divine promise of our Lord and Saviour to the chief of his disciples: "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren." (*See* S. Agathon, epistle to the Emperor, approved by the Sixth Œcumenical Council.)

This gift of unfailing truth and faith was divinely bestowed on Peter and on his successors in this Chair, that they might discharge the duties of their exalted office for the salvation of all; that the universal flock of Christ, turned by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished by heavenly teaching, that the occasion of schism being removed, the whole Church might be preserved in unity, and, supported by its foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell.

But since in this our age, in which the salutary efficacy of the Apostolic

demptor Ecclesiam suam in definiendâ doctrinâ de fid vel moribus instructam esse voluit; ideoque ejusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ, irreformabiles esse.

Si quis autem huic Nostræ definitioni contradicere, quod Deus avertat præsumpserit; anathema sit.

Datum Romæ, in publicâ Sessione in Vaticanâ Basilicâ solemniter celebratâ anno Incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo octingentesimo septuagesimo, die decimâ octavâ Julii.

Pontificatûs Nostri anno vigesimo quinto.

Ita est,

JOSEPHUS,
Episcopus S. Hippolyti,
Secretarius Concilii Vaticani.

office is more than ever required, not a few are found who oppose its authority, we judge it to be necessary solemnly to assert the prerogative which the only begotten Son of God deigned to join to the supreme pastoral office.

Therefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition derived from the commencement of the Christian Faith, to the glory of God our Saviour, to the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and to the salvation of Christian nations, *Sacro approbante Concilio*, we teach and define that it is a divinely revealed dogma: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex Cathedrâ*, that is, when in discharge of his office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, he defines, in virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, a doctrine of faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, is endowed by the divine assistance promised to him in Blessed Peter, with that infallibility with which our divine Redeemer willed that the Church should be furnished in defining doctrine of faith or morals; and, therefore, that such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves and not in virtue of the consent of the Church.

But if any (which may God avert) shall presume to contradict this our definition, let him be anathema.

Given at Rome, in the public session solemnly held in the Vatican Basilica in the year of Our Lord's Incarnation, One thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July.

In the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate.

'Tis so.

JOSEPH,
Bishop of S. Hippolyte,
Secretary of the Vatican Council.

PAPAL BRIEF.

[On the eve of our last publication we received the Holy Father's most gracious Brief addressed to Dr. Ward. Many readers have asked us to publish a translation, and it gives us much pleasure to comply with so flattering a request. We also print again the Brief, in our impression of which there were several typographical errors.]

PIUS P.P. IX.

DILECTE FILI, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.—Gratulamur tibi, dilecte fili, quod in filiorum Dei lucem vocatus, idem lumen aliorum mentibus offundere certes; et, in gremium sanctæ Matris Ecclesiæ receptus, sanctitatem ejus ostendere et illustrare studeas, supremique ejusdem Pastoris divinam asserere auctoritatem, vindicare prærogativas, jura omnia tueri. Nobilitatem in hoc videmus animi, qui, ad veritatem maturo compulsus examine, eo incensiore ignis flagrat amore, quo majore contentione illam est adeptus; et eo impensiore nisu beneficium acceptum latius porrigere satagit, quo miseriorem, propriâ doctus experientiâ, censet errantium conditionem. Indefessus autem labor, quo pluribus ab hinc annis dona omnia ingenii, scientiæ, eruditionis, eloquentiæ, tibi a Domino largita, confers ad religionis nostræ Sanctissimæ et hujus Apostolicæ Sedis causam propugnandam, fidem perspicue præfert inditam menti tuæ et charitatem in tuo corde diffusam; quibus urgeris ad redimendum præteritum tempus, et certamen imprudenter alias pro errore fortasse commissum rependendum per alacrem ac strenuam veritatis defensionem. Quoniam vero merces fidelis paratur seminanti justitiam, et qui ad eam erudiunt multos fulgebunt quasi stellæ in perpetuas æternitates, dum te tuum ita sertum texere gaudemus, te simul hortamur, ut instes proposito tuo, et impigre præliari pergas prælia Domini, quo et plures semper ad viam veritatis adducas et splendidius tibi compares æternæ gloriæ pondus. Necessarias idcirco ad hoc vires tibi ominamur, copiosaque adprecamur gratiæ cœlestis auxilia et fausta omnia; eorumque auspicem et paternæ nostræ benevolentiæ pignus Apostolicam Benedictionem tibi peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romæ, apud Sanctum Petrum, die 4 Julii, anno 1870, Pontificatûs Nostri anno vicesimo quinto.

PIUS P.P. IX.

Dilecto Filio GEORGIO WARD.

[TRANSLATION.]

PIUS P.P. IX.

BELOVED SON, health and Apostolic Benediction.

We congratulate thee, beloved son, that having been called into the light of God's sons, thou labourest to diffuse the same light over the minds of others; and that, having been received into the bosom of Holy Mother Church, thou studiest to exhibit and illustrate her holiness, and to assert the divine authority of her supreme pastor, to vindicate his prerogatives, to defend all his rights. In this we see the nobleness of a mind which, having been drawn forcibly to the truth by mature examination, burns for it with more inflamed love, in proportion as it has gained it with greater labour; and occupies itself with extending further the received blessing with more intense effort, in proportion as (taught by its own experience) it accounts the condition of those in error more miserable. The unwearied labour with which, for many years past, thou hast applied all the gifts of ability, knowledge, erudition, eloquence, given thee by the Lord, to supporting the cause of our most holy religion and of this Apostolic See, plainly shows the faith inherent in thy mind and the charity diffused in thy heart, whereby thou art pressed to redeem the past time, and to atone for any controversy formerly perhaps undertaken in behalf of error, by alacrity and strenuousness in defending truth. But since a sure reward is prepared for him who sows justice, and those who train many thereto shall shine like stars for ever and ever, while we rejoice that thou thus wreathest for thyself a garland, we exhort thee at the same time that thou pursue thy design, and continue to fight valiantly the Lord's battles, in order that thou mayest ever lead forward more into the way of truth, and mayest obtain for thyself a more splendid weight of eternal glory. We wish thee, therefore, the necessary strength for this, and supplicate copious helps of divine grace and all blessings; and as the foretaste of these and as a pledge of our paternal good-will, we very lovingly impart to thee the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, at Saint Peter's, on the 4th day of July, in the year 1870, being the twenty-fifth of our Pontificate.

PIUS P.P. IX.

Notices of Books.

Ignatius Loyola and the Early Jesuits. By STEWART ROSE. Longmans. 1870.

"IGNATIUS LOYOLA" was not only a great saint, but also the founder of a great religious order, the most famous in the world, because uniformly the most spoken against, by all kinds of people, good, bad, and indifferent. Mr. Rose is a fervent admirer, not only of the saint, but of the order as well, and yet on the title-page of his book, and we think throughout it, the man of God whom the Pope has canonized is simply Ignatius. His special title to our reverence and respect is suppressed, for if the saint had not been a saint it is possible enough that his order, if he could have founded it, would have been nothing better than a society of Freemasons or Odd Fellows, lying under the curse of the Church, outlaws of the kingdom of God.

A life of the saint by an enemy of his order might have been put forth in the same way; probably a man indifferent to all religions, if such a man can be found, might have adopted the same method; and so we confess that we have been struck, and not altogether pleasantly, by this act of Mr. Rose, who is not merely a friend, but an enthusiastic devotee, and who has evidently constrained himself from time to time lest he should break forth into hymns of praise before the saint he worships. It is possible that Mr. Rose thought he could make the saint known and respected where he is now unknown and hated, by this apparent disguise, and that the explanation is thus simple. If he can introduce Saint Ignatius in disguise among his friends, and can persuade them, by changing his name, to speak to him, or to allow him to speak to them, so much the better, he thinks, it will be for the latter. At first sight it seems a harmless stratagem, for missioners do not always enter a country with the cross borne before them, and chanting their office with their Breviary in their hands, as Saint Augustine came into Kent. But in this case, it seems to us that the disguise is impossible, for Saint Ignatius would not be Saint Ignatius then. He was a "whole man" from his conversion, or indeed from his earliest years, to his most blessed death. It seems to us absolutely impossible to hide him in any way, or disguise him so that people should become fond of him without knowing who he is. Mr. Rose has apparently thought otherwise, and there we must leave the matter.

If we have guessed aright the reasons that moved Mr. Rose to give the form he has given to his Life of Saint Ignatius, we must read that Life in the light of those reasons, if we are to be just to him, and so far we must speak highly of his work. As a literary Life of a Saint—we cannot help

repeating that we are struck by certain incongruities in the matter—the book is well written, and might, probably, but for the dreaded subject of it, find its way into regions where Lives of Saints are held as the scum of the earth, or if not hated, utterly despised as an old woman's tale, unfit for the polished modern who has discovered that there is no such thing as the supernatural, except in the imagination of people whose minds are more or less weak.

The following passage will probably give a very fair notion of the book, for we think it will convey to the mind of the reader an accurate impression both of its strength and weakness; for Mr. Rose, by dwelling more on the natural side than on the supernatural, has exposed himself to attacks in flank and rear:—

"Few persons, it must be confessed, have pursued knowledge under greater difficulties than did Ignatius Loyola. By natural temperament as well as by long habit, indisposed to studious application, he both mastered the rudiments of a liberal education, and earned an honourable distinction in letters, not like others in the days of supple youth, or hopeful early manhood, but in staid middle life; for at the time he took his degree in philosophy, he had probably entered into his forty-fourth year; at an age therefore when the mind is more capable of applying its powers and utilizing its stores than of adapting itself to new forms and acquiring new resources. Poor and independent, he endured hardships and submitted to humiliations such as would have broken the spirit or exhausted the patience of ordinary men; and all this drudgery he went through for no earthly advantage, for none of those rewards which are reckoned among the objects of a laudable ambition. Had it been otherwise; had he laboured for the interests of science, or of literature, or of material progress; had he even but competed successfully for some of those rich prizes which the world has in its gift, the energy and industry of the man would have been the theme of universal panegyric. But Ignatius laboured only for God; and the world makes no account of that which is done only for Him who created it. It has refused Ignatius, therefore, even that fair meed of praise which is due to a noble resolution and a courageous perseverance; it has denied or disparaged his intellectual powers" (p. 131).

Mr. Rose has here given a perfect answer to certain persons by simply telling them truths which they do not like to hear. On the other hand, it may be very fairly lamented that he has not told the whole truth, and for ourselves we should not like to account in this way for the great learning and theological knowledge of Saint Ignatius. No doubt he applied himself with great diligence to his studies; but our own belief is that the studies were not much, and that the man who had seen "the visions of God" in Manresa came to his great knowledge very much like Albertus Magnus. Mr. Rose has his answer, and we admit it to be strong: that he was writing as a literary man for heretics, not for Catholics, and that he could account for the fact in a natural way; but, after all, was the fact itself natural in the case of Saint Ignatius?

This method of writing has certainly its dangers, and Mr. Rose has driven his ship amid the breakers more than once; in p. 394 we have "the first victim to religious intolerance;" in p. 446, "toleration was a wisdom not understood in those days;" in p. 468, "the religion of Christ, which under *all its forms*,"—the italics are ours; in p. 206, "the cruel power of the

Inquisition." That was the Inquisition of Spain; but the Roman Inquisition is insulted and maligned in the following terms, though it must be admitted that Mr. Rose had no such intentions; he simply meant to give it the highest possible praise:—

"The Inquisitors of Rome were a court of learned divines, acute critics, high authorities on literature, ready to allow tacitly a considerable licence to men of genius who did not infringe on certain points on which the Pontiffs were susceptible" (p. 468).

A modern poet has furnished considerable amusement to the world by a voluntary exposition of his own ignorance in a recent and voluminous work. He seems to have confounded the heretic Molinos with the learned Jesuit theologian Luis Molina. Mr. Rose has done the same, and his sin is certainly the greater of the two while writing of Saint Ignatius. Thus we have, in p. 87, "the Molinists and the Quietists of the succeeding century." If he meant really the Molinists, which is not an uncommon word, he certainly should not have joined them with their enemies, the Quietists, nor spoken disrespectfully of the sons of Saint Ignatius.

In p. 177 we read something that startles us: "Contarini had written a treatise on Justification, which was in accordance with the views of Luther. Pole congratulated him with admiration."

If this be true it must be admitted that the writings of Luther have never been correctly printed, and that his followers have corrupted the doctrine he gave them. Cardinal Contarini refuted Luther, and his treatise is extant in proof, called "Confutatio Articulorum seu Quæstionum Lutheri," and it begins with the refutation of Luther's views on Justification.

In the present day the following story will be read with great interest, for it shows very clearly how deeply the saints saw into the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy. One of the fathers of the Society had so far forgotten himself in a sermon as to say that the Pope "ought" to do something, and was sent for by the saint, who asked him "How many are there in the world?" "None besides the Bishop of Rome," replied Otelli. "How then," said Ignatius, "do you presume to make mention from the pulpit of a person so exalted, and even speak of his conduct as if you could judge what he ought to do?" (pp. 351, 352.)

Mr. Rose has been very sparing of references to his authorities, and, surely, this is rather a grave omission in a literary work. For instance, we should have been glad to know his authority for saying, p. 410, that Saint John of the Cross was received into the Roman College. And in p. 79 we have no hint who the Carthusian was who in his treatise on Spiritual Communion tells the story of the sumpter mule. Rodriguez speaks of the treatise as being in manuscript when he wrote; has it been printed?

Saint Anselm. By R. W. CHURCH, Rector of Whatley. Macmillan & Co. 1870.

IF this book had been published without the name of the writer, we should have said of it, we verily believe, that it was an attempt, conscious or unconscious, to destroy in men's minds every trace of supernatural impressions; for a life of Saint Anselm with the sanctity not only omitted, but explained down to the level of the "judicious Hooker," is, we humbly but resolutely maintain, an indefensible outrage, an act of offensive barbarism, not to be tolerated even as a work of mere literary labouring. We are filled with wonder and dismay, now that we have read the book through, at the change that has been wrought in England within thirty years; at the profound moral deterioration, and at the calm and easy bearing of men going back, almost with their eyes open, to the unhealthy swamps of the pagans. Mr. Church is going with the current, like others, and his life of Saint Anselm is a melancholy proof that he has lost his hold of truths which at one time he held in part. There is a most marked divergence of his present writing from the writing of twenty-seven years ago,* and to which he refers in the Prefatory Notice, apparently unconscious of the change that has been wrought within him.

It would be something criminal if we were to dwell for a moment on the style and artistic completeness of this work, when the inevitable effect of it is to ruin in men's minds the fundamental notions of holiness of life, simplicity of purpose, and unswerving obedience. The writer has laboured at his task, and, in his anxiety to be, as he thinks, just, has so arranged his statements occasionally that we are unable always to understand what he really means. Here is an illustration in the very beginning of the book:—

"For eighteen centuries Christianity has been acting on human society; we know but too well how far it is from having really made the world Christian. . . . . But for the first ten of those centuries it can hardly be said to have leavened society at all. Its influence on individuals so vast and astonishing was no measure at all of its influence on society at large. It acted upon it doubtless with enormous power; but it was as an extraneous and foreign agent, which destroys and shapes, but does not renew. It turned the course of events, it changed worship, it built churches, it suppressed customs and institutions . . . . ." (p. 3).

It passes our understanding utterly to reconcile these assertions one with another. Christianity, says Mr. Church, hardly "leavened society at all;" yet it "changed worship," and further "suppressed customs and institutions." Customs and institutions are generally regarded as the visible signs of the interior state of a people. Mr. Church's language is most clear. He denies that the Christian religion had, in ten centuries,

* See "British Critic," No. 65, January, 1843.

"found its way to the heart of society," and yet he adds that it "changed worship." The passage is much too long to quote, but it is perfectly portentous. We can make room, however, for a little of it.

"The household, the shop, the market, the school, the farm, the places of law and conversation, and amusement, never, or but seldom, appeared as the scenes and trial places of a Christian life. Other traditions kept hold of them, and good or bad, they were of times when there was no Christianity. Society was a long time unlearning heathenism; it has not done so yet; but it had hardly begun, at any rate it was only just beginning to imagine the possibility of such a thing in the eleventh century" (p. 4).

Let us consider what this means. That men built churches, heard mass, confessed their sins, received the last sacraments, and were buried with the rites of the Church, hoping by the prayers of the living to be delivered from Purgatory, and yet had not imagined the "possibility" of unlearning heathenism. We do not understand it.

Mr. Church goes on:—

"Thus that combination of real and earnest religion with everyday pursuits of life, which, in idea at least, is so natural and so easy to us, and is to a very real degree protected and assisted by general usages and ways of thinking, was then almost inconceivable."

In a society thus at variance with its outward profession surely some signs must be found of its profound hypocrisy. If the people were pagans at heart, and Catholics only on the surface, there must be some trace of that inconsistency in their works, and, above all, in the writings of men; for certainly writers in general are not blind to the state of things around them. Well, out of this corrupt condition the only books that come forth, or, at least, that are preserved, are Christian, the fragments of local laws are Christian; and yet Mr. Church, an educated and learned man, denounces thirty generations as impostors, hypocrites, and rogues, who either heard mass or said it, and were the whole time heathens in heart.

How came men to build churches, or even to allow them to be built, if the "household, the shop, the market, the school," were under the dominion of an un-Christian tradition? Then, again, who were the schoolmasters for ten centuries who secretly taught paganism while professing Christianity? It is quite possible that, in many countries, perhaps it was so in England, throughout, the only schoolmaster was a monk. But Mr. Church thinks the monk an exception to the rest of his fellow-creatures, a man who broke utterly with the world, as indeed he did, and yet in the school which he taught, and in the conversation held with seculars, he forgot the purpose of his life, and allowed his pupils to grow up, and his friends to be content, without "unlearning heathenism," of which they saw no trace whatever in the public worship in which they joined, and which they were bound to join in under pain of damnation.

It is quite plain that the Church is, in the opinion of the writer, a failure; that she actually failed to convert the heathen, and could show

only a few monasteries as her harvest in the eleventh century: for the age of Saint Anselm was a time, according to Mr. Church,

"when all serious efforts at ordering life on religious principles were concentrated in a small body of professed ascetics" (p. 87).

What makes it still worse is that these monasteries were governed by regulations in which, with some good in them—for Mr. Church is tolerant—

"we should find much that is childish, much that is mischievous, much that is simply incomprehensible" (p. 67).

We must say it once more, we cannot understand all this. Mr. Church is an educated man, and has read books; but he can write, as he has done, it seems, and apparently believes the very ridiculous statements thus put forth. He seems, we think, not to have understood much of what he is writing about, for he says that in "the eleventh century, as in those immediately before and after it," every man who was in earnest about pleasing God, turned his thoughts at once to the "monastic profession" (p. 2). Thus, all the secular clergy are delivered over as reprobates, who had no thought of serving God. Married men and married women are also shut out with the lost, and only monks could save their souls. Thus there is a sharp line drawn in the imagination of the writer between ordinary people living in the world, and those who followed the counsels of perfection, which, at the same time, severs the former from all chances of leading decent lives, to say nothing of saving their souls, and the result is that, according to this notion, the grace of vocation to the religious life is necessary to salvation.

But the life of a monk, after all, is nothing out of the common way; for this is all it means, according to Mr. Church:—

"The three main purposes for which a monk professed to live—worship, improvement, and work" (p. 46).

He had said before, that "self-improvement" was the fulfilling of God's purpose (p. 2). Self-improvement may be a good or bad thing, according to the way, and the form, in which a man improves himself. In these days, it does not mean even the keeping of the Commandments, still less the counsels of perfection; and we are not disposed to admit that there ever was a monk in the world who looked on "self-improvement"—taking the word in such a sense—as being a good reason for giving up the world, or a reason at all.

The "discipline of the Benedictine Order" is discussed at some length in ch. iii., but the writer seems to us to have regarded the Constitutions of Lanfranc, which are little more than an *Ordo recitandi*, as a rule of the interior life; and in consequence to have reduced the "monastic profession" to mere outward observances. He makes excuses for the minute and "technical regulations," and asks us to forgive them, because—

"In those ages there was little trust in individual self-management; and it was a fundamental assumption that there was no living an earnest,

Christian life, without a jealous and pervading system of control and rule" (p. 43).

Well, we believe that "those ages" did precisely as the present age is doing, and as all ages before and between them did. The spiritual, or the "earnest Christian life," whether in the cloister or in the world, is never trusted to "individual self-management," and is always under "control and rule;" for in no other way does it seem possible to guard against the risks and illusions to which people are inevitably exposed the moment they attempt to fight against the world and the devil, when directed only by themselves.

We have taken some trouble to arrive at the meaning of Mr. Church when he is speaking of the spiritual life of Catholics, and we believe it to be this: that all Christians about the time of S. Anselm, and before, who were Christians in deed, as well as in name, entered a monastery while the people outside were simply reprobates, who never thought of looking after their soul's salvation. He shall speak for himself:—

"Let a man throw himself into the society of his day then, and he found himself in an atmosphere to which real religion, the religion of self-conquest and love, was simply a thing alien or unmeaning, which no one imagined himself called to think of" (p. 4).

This was the world at large, and as we have seen by an extract already made, that "all serious efforts" to lead a Christian life were confined to "professed ascetics," it seems to us plain that, according to Mr. Church, the saved and the lost in the eleventh century could be known to anybody who cared to inquire; the former were in the monasteries, and the latter were in the world; fathers and mothers, perhaps, bringing up their children in the fear of God, hoping for them the grace of a vocation to a higher life than that which the good providence of their heavenly Father had lovingly provided for themselves, were walking on the broad way of destruction.

Still further wonders meet us. Mr. Church having stamped all secular persons, lay and ecclesiastic, with the brand of reprobation, brings down the "professed ascetics" to the level of what ordinary Christians are in in the Church, thereby destroying in theory the grace of vocation, and getting rid of the counsels of perfection. It is possible that he may allow that "professed ascetics" led a harder life, physically considered, than is required of good Christians, but that certainly is all. He does not seem to see that the interior life of the monk was in the least degree a higher life than that which we are all bound to live. The monk was under authority and rule external to himself, with fixed hours for his meals and his sleep; there was scarcely anything else that he did, according to Mr. Church, of which it could be said that a man could omit it who meant to lead an ordinary good life. Besides, there were in the monasteries "shortcomings and fantastic usages and misdirections" (p. 68); so that, after all, the poor monk was in as much danger within as without, and had gained very little by abandoning the world. But Mr. Church does

admit that he did gain something by the profession of asceticism, for he entered a religious house, and the monasteries

"were schools of discipline, and there were no others. They upheld and exhibited the great, then almost the original idea, that men needed to rule and govern themselves, that they could do it, and that no use of life was noble and perfect without this ruling. . . . . They did good work then, and for future times, by imposing on society the idea of self-control and self-maintained discipline" (p. 68).

There is nothing here that is not the duty of every man, and always has been his duty; but the expressions used by Mr. Church are not pleasant, and prove once more the charge brought against the revived Anglicanism of Oxford, that it is essentially a Pelagian revival. One more quotation before we quit the subject:—

"The governing thought of monastic life was, that it was a warfare, *militia*, and a monastery was a camp or barrack" (p. 44).

A monastery is no doubt a camp, because its members are soldiers fighting under the banner of the cross, but so are all Christians; we are all soldiers encamped and entrenched against the world, within the Church, on our way to our own country, fighting daily and hourly, or ought to be, against the enemy of our souls. Mr. Church therefore says nothing of the monastic life that has not been already said of the life of every man: *militia est vita hominis super terram*, Job vii. i. It was one of the nicknames given by Wicliffe to the religious orders, when he wished to destroy among people the very memory of the counsels of perfection. With him the monasteries were the camps of Cain, and the breaking up of the camp is to break down the observance even of precepts.

There can be no objection to the word in itself, but the objection is to the use made of it, and to the meaning assigned to it. Every Catholic is a soldier of Christ, and his life is a warfare, and his dwelling a camp; but the monk and the friar are nobler soldiers than the layman, for they have bound themselves to aim at the end by higher means, and nothing but harm can come to them as well as to the layman, if we forget the difference between them. A monk does not enter a monastery simply to escape from the world; that is but a small part of his purpose in comparison with the rest of it. All men may aim at perfection in the world and out of it, and it may be obtained, but the perfection of the monk is different from the perfection of the layman; and his life being already settled in a state of perfection compels him to be what a layman living in the world can scarcely ever be.

Mr. Church seems to think that the whole world in Europe, during the time he is treating of, was sunk in absolute ruffianism and forgetfulness of God, and that all goodness took refuge in the cloister. But he offers no evidence in proof, and it is easy enough to convict him of his mistake by quotations from his own book. In the first place it is not easy to see how the monasteries could have existed at all in a lawless age, if the fear of God had been utterly unknown. We see in our day, which boasts

somewhat of its piety, that monasteries are ruthlessly destroyed. Then, again, how came men to enter them at all, some young, some in middle life, and others in their old age? Mr. Church says of S. Anselm:

"From his boyhood he seems to have been a student, he early felt the common attractions of the age for the monastic life" (p. 14).

Now, we do not think that anyone will maintain that the piety of men in the world was gone when vocations were thus common. S. Anselm must have been piously nurtured, and it is preposterous to suppose that he was the exception in his native place or elsewhere.

Again, when S. Anselm appealed to the Pope, proceedings against him were stayed. Mr. Church accounts for the fact in this way, apparently unconscious of the value of the admission he makes:—

"It meant that no one could pass judgment on an Archbishop of Canterbury except the highest judge and authority in Christendom, the Pope himself; and the claim came home too powerfully to the minds of men, both as Christians and as Englishmen, for the king's Norman bishops to think of questioning it" (p. 205).

Here we see that the Norman bishops were foiled by what is called in our day, public opinion; they could not do what they wished because the people were too good Christians. And, further on, Mr. Church tells us, and tells us truly, that the barons, lawless and reckless men, refused to disown the archbishop at the king's bidding, even after the bishops had so basely deserted him. They answered, "He is our archbishop." These men certainly could not have been heathens, and they were probably no better than other barons in France and Germany, or their tenants among whom they usually lived.

The bishops, it is to be confessed with shame, did meanly offer to do the will of William the Red King, but not so the barons; and Mr. Church, repeating and admitting the account of Eadmer, thus describes the result:—

"On all sides they [the bishops] met mocking eyes and scowling looks, and heard themselves spoken of in bywords of reproach" (p. 209).

These men of the mocking eyes had the faith in them, and confessed i before men, yet they are the men of whom that "society" was formed of which Mr. Church has said that "it was only just beginning to imagine the possibility" of "unlearning heathenism."

We now turn to those parts of the book in which the writer speaks directly of the Catholic religion, and especially of the Sovereign Pontiff. The clergy, he says, in order "to resist and counterbalance" the power of the sword in the hands of kings and others,

"brought in another kind of power, which, in the course of things, worked great mischief, and had to be taken away. What is worse, they based this power, not always consciously, indeed, yet in fact, upon ideas and documents which were false. Their great lever was a belief in a divine universal theocracy, appointed by God, and assigned by Christ to the Pope; a

belief which springing out of the natural growth of traditions, utilities, and claims, was at last boldly founded on gross forgeries, and has developed into the pretentions of the later Popes, which to this day astonish a world which has seen many wonders" (pp. 166, 167).

Even at this day such writing as this comes out of the most learned, most decent, and most cultivated school in the Anglican religion, and in the present instance from one of its gentlest and fairest members. It is written by a minister of religion, but there is nothing in it that an infidel could not have written. In another place we read thus:—

"This was the victory, butwhat was gained by it? It was, of course, directly and outwardly the victory of a cause which has never been popular in England. It renewed and strengthened the ties which connected England with that great centre of Christendom, where justice and corruption, high aims and the vilest rapacity and fraud, undeniable majesty and undeniable hollowness, were then, as they have ever been, so strangely and inextricably combined. Anselm's victory with its circumstances, was one of the steps which made Rome more powerful in England, even with the profound and undoubting beliefs of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, that did not recommend it to the sympathy of Englishmen: it is not likely to do so now. . . . . .

"What was then, after all, the school and focus of religious activity and effort, as well as the seat of an encroaching and usurping centralization—the Roman Church" (pp. 288, 289).

Mr. Church is essentially as deep in the mire of mere Protestantism as any of the more ignorant members of his sect; he has the same dislike to the authority of the Pontiff, and the same notions about it; he does not use all the turgid expressions of his co-religionists, but the substance is here; he turns away from the Vicar of Christ, and will not have him to rule over him, because he is a foreign prince, who has nothing to recommend him to the "sympathies of Englishmen."

S. Anselm wrought miracles, and Mr. Church has not omitted to notice the fact, but we are in doubt as to the nature of that admission. Thus he writes:—

"As was to be expected, the presence of such a man raised the expectation of miracles" (p. 232).

"From such a man the ideas of the day expected miracles; the sick came to him for relief; his attendants were ready to believe that they had good reason for coming" (p. 236).

"As no history at this time, even if only concerned, so far as this was possible, with secular affairs, was without miracle, it cannot be expected that such a life as Anselm's could be witnessed without expecting them, or without implying them. They were part of the unquestioned belief and tacit assumptions of everybody who lived around him. Undoubtedly he believed that such things happened" (p. 239).

We think Mr. Church unjust to S. Anselm also on the subject which occupied the greater part of his episcopate—that of investiture. These are his words:—

"Intellectually and morally his was not a mind to lay great stress on matters of this kind; in temper he was too considerate and ready to allow for others; in his ways of thinking he was too intent on wider and loftier views to see such a question as this with the keen and accurate instinct of a statesman. His own conduct shows that there was nothing in homage or investiture to shock him; at first he looked on them as a matter of course" (p. 276).

Against this we must put his letter to a countess in Flanders, whom with her husband he praises for their abstinence from giving investiture. In that letter he is not writing as a person indifferent, and he speaks strongly too, for he says that the investiture was a "domination" over the "bride of Christ." He then adds: "he was a king himself, and knew the duties of princes who pronounced this curse on princes who would have the sanctuary of God as their hereditary property. O my God make them as a wheel, and as stubble before the wind, &c. It is not David who speaks but the Spirit of God the Son of David" (lib. iii., ep. 59).

Mr. Church misunderstands the Saint on this point, and gives an erroneous explanation of his language, or, more correctly speaking, the abstinence from argument. The Sovereign Pontiff had spoken the decisive word, and the archbishop never argued the question after that. His work was very simple and very plain, and that he did, and nothing else, and nothing less,—to obey. That was his answer to the reasons of his adversaries, and to the demands of the king: he had nothing to do but to obey the Pope. The question was no longer to be argued, and he was not going to dispute with any man about a plain duty; the Supreme Judge had declared the law, and the Archbishop of Canterbury obeyed. In another place (p. 293), Mr. Church says that "he felt this was the fight of the day, and he held on unmoved." Did he then see "nothing in homage or investiture to shock him?"

We must now speak of something that is very sad, and most disheartening. Mr. Church, after reciting the touching account of S. Anselm's most holy death, which Eadmer has preserved, reminds his reader of the deathbed—of whom? Well, we write it not without pain; of Richard Hooker, the Erastian, and the Calvinistic author of the "Ecclesiastical Polity." Here are the words of shame and insult:—

"To die as Anselm died, or to die as Hooker died, is to die in much the same manner; with the same view of life now and to come, the same sense of duty, the same faith" (p. 300).

Richard Hooker was as different from S. Anselm as a heretic can be from a saint. He renounced the Pope, and submitted in all things to the civil power. In the dedication prefixed to the fifth book of his "Ecclesiastical Polity," he says:—

"The true inscription, style, or title of all churches as yet standing within this realm, 'By the goodness of Almighty God and His servant Elizabeth, we are'"

The Calvinism of the man is as clear and as undisguised as his repulsive

abjection before the "sacred power matched with incomparable goodness of nature," with which, in his wretched servility, he invests Elizabeth These are his words:—

"The real Presence of Christ's most Blessed Body and Blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament" ("Eccles. Polity," bk. v., ch. 67, § 6).

Mr. Church says of the saint and the heretic that they had "the same sense of duty, the same faith," and we are simply amazed.

We are told by the author that the Royal Supremacy was set up by the conqueror, and that it was then nearly what it is now over the Anglican Establishment. But perhaps we may be doing Mr. Church some injustice, and lest we should do so, we subjoin his words:—

"Ecclesiastical as well as civil causes came to his (the Conqueror's) court. Over churchmen as well as laymen he asserted his authority, and both equally resorted to his justice. . . . . He asserted and exercised his right to correct, to reform, to legislate for the Church, and no one thought of contradicting him" (p. 120).

We admit that the Conqueror interfered with the rights of the Church; but we do not admit this statement of Mr. Church. It is not true; for in all the lands or manors of the Archbishop of Canterbury the king had by custom the cognisance of three pleas only; and it is a notorious fact that over the persons of ecclesiastics the king had no jurisdiction whatever, either in law or in fact, and he never obtained it even by custom.

"And thus began that system of appeals to Rome, and of inviting foreign interference in our home concerns, which grew to such a mischievous and scandalous height; and Anselm was the beginner of it" (p. 223).

Here Mr. Church commits himself to the clear assertion of a fact, and we find him wrong. There were appeals before S. Anselm. There was either an appeal, or the instituting of a suit originally in Rome, by Thomas of York, against Lanfranc himself, and there certainly was an appeal made by Robert, the predecessor of Lanfranc, who was expelled from Canterbury by a decree of the Witenagemote. The Abbot of Abingdon and the convent appealed to the Pope against King Kenulf, more than two hundred years before the Conquest, and S. Wilfrid before them, and we must therefore admit that S. Anselm certainly was not "the beginner" of a "system of appeals to Rome," notwithstanding the positive assertion of Mr. Church. We have here the old story—"foreign interference;" the ideas of the sixteenth century attributed to the eleventh, which had never even conceived them. William the Conqueror and his sons might have disliked the interference of the Pope, but they never dreamt of it as anything "foreign." The Pope was their father and their lord—the Apostle, as he was commonly called, and they would have scorned to evade his authority by pleading that he was a foreigner, who had no jurisdiction in this realm. Mr. Church writes of Lanfranc as if he had been disposed to resist the Pope; and it is true that Lanfranc was not blameless in all his

relations with the Holy See, but for all that, Lanfranc, like all his contemporaries, firmly held that the Pope was the successor of S. Peter and the Vicar of our Lord, whom every one was bound to obey, as may be seen in the discourse preserved by William of Malmesbury.*

Mr. Church seems to have a hatred of the Holy See deep and abiding, and we regret it more than we can tell. Elegant learning can never supply the absence of the grace of God; and men of the most complete intellectual cultivation can be as violent as the uncivilized orators of the Protestant mob. This is the way Mr. Church writes:—

"The Pope who formally canonized S. Anselm is said to have been Alexander VI., Roderic Borgia. 'In the visible Church the evil are ever mingled with the good.'

"But a very different judge had already interpreted the opinion of Christendom about Anselm. Before he had suffered the indignity of a canonization at the hands of Borgia, Dante had consecrated his memory," &c. (p. 301).

This language is perfectly amazing. "The indignity of canonization at the hands of Borgia." First of all, is Mr. Church sure of his fact? Alexander VI. issued a commission empowering the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Morton, and the Bishop of Durham, to report to him on the miracles of S. Anselm, but did he do more than that? The Ghibelline Dante is a reverenced authority, but the Vicar of Christ is insulted, and Mr. Church evidently believes the fables told of Alexander VI. In doing so he sets at nought apparently a doctrine he is supposed to hold, namely, that the unworthiness of the minister does not destroy the effects of the rites. If he was canonized by Alexander VI., we see no indignity in it, and Mr. Church himself is content to be the minister of a religion which Henry VIII. invented.

The Catechism illustrated in Passages from the Holy Scriptures; with an Appendix and Notes. Compiled by the Rev. JOHN B. BAGSHAWE, Missionary Rector of S. Elizabeth's, Richmond. London: Washbourne. 1870.

THIS little book seems to us very valuable. It might seem, at first sight, one of a class exceedingly common on every side of us. But, in truth, it is widely different—we may say opposite,—and the author has done all that was possible, both by the selection of his title and still more by the explanation of it given in his preface, to point out the dif-

---

* Estque tunc demum omnium ecclesiasticarum rerum rata dispensatio, si successorum beati Petri fuerit comprobata judicio.

ference. The booksellers' counters run over with "Scriptural proofs" of the Thirty-Nine Articles, of the Church Catechism, of the Assemblies' Catechism, of every conceivable form of opinion around us. We can quite conceive that Protestants, casting a cursory glance over the little volume before us, might mistake it for "Scriptural proofs of the doctrine of the Catholic Catechism." To avoid this misconception, the author has been careful to announce both on its title-page and its back, that his object is to *illustrate*, not prove, the Catechism. He says :—

"I have called the book the Catechism *illustrated*, because it does not attempt or profess to prove the Catholic Faith from Scripture. To do so would be entirely contrary to the spirit of the Church. Every Catholic knows that the doctrines of the Catholic Church are independent of Scripture; that is to say, that the Church teaches from the plentitude of the powers committed to her, that she did so from the beginning, before the New Testament was written—centuries indeed before the Bible was collected into its present form; and that she would have done so precisely in the same manner had they never been written. For example, every Catholic knows that the faith of the Church about the Holy Eucharist would have been precisely what it is, had it pleased God that not one of the passages relating to It had ever been written; and therefore that these passages, however clear they may be, cannot be properly referred to as the ground of the Church's teaching."

"A Catholic looks upon the Church and the Holy Scriptures as two distinct and independent sources of religious knowledge, both coming from God—the one illustrating and explaining indeed, but not the mere echo of the other, dependent on it for authority."—(*Preface*, p. vii.)

This cannot be too clearly stated or too emphatically impressed, especially upon English Catholics. For it must not be forgotten that, in our day, more than half, at the very least, of the English Catholics existing are either converts or have been brought up by convert parents. It is therefore exceedingly natural that many among them (although, as a matter of strict doctrine, they would admit what our author here justly says "every Catholic knows") have never succeeded in clearing, either their reason or still more their imagination, of the notion, which is for all English Protestants a first principle to be taken for granted, not proved, viz., that revelation and Scripture are convertible terms; that Scripture contains whatever Almighty God has revealed; and that the office of the Church, of theologians, of preachers and teachers of every class, is merely to explain and enforce what Scripture says.

Lord Macaulay well expresses the national creed when he says, "It is plain that a Christain of the fifth century, with a Bible, is neither better nor worse situated than a Christian of the nineteenth century with a Bible, candour and natural acuteness being of course supposed to be equal. . . . . It seems to us, therefore, that we can have no security for the future against the prevalence of any theological error that ever has prevailed in times past among Christian men. . . . . When we reflect that Sir Thomas More was ready to die for the doctrine of Transubstantiation, we cannot but feel some doubt whether the doctrine of Transubstantiation may not triumph over all opposition. More was a man of eminent talents. He had all the information on the subject that we have, or that, while the world lasts, any human being

will have. The text, 'This is my Body,' was in his New Testament as it is in ours. . . . . We are therefore unable to understand why what Sir Thomas More believed respecting Transubstantiation may not be believed to the end of time by men equal in abilities and honesty to Sir Thomas More. But Sir Thomas More is one of the choice specimens of human wisdom and virtue," &c.

This passage seems to us remarkable, not merely as illustrating what the author himself says, that "according to the doctrine of the Protestant churches, all Divine truth is recorded in certain books," and "is equally open to all who, in any age, can read those books"; but (what is much more curious) that Lord Macaulay had no suspicion that Sir Thomas More, or any Catholic, based his belief on any other ground. It had evidently never occurred to him to imagine it possible that, if Sir Thomas More had been asked, "Why do you believe in Transubstantiation?" he could possibly give any answer except "Because I find in Scripture the words, 'This is My Body,' and I think they ought to be interpreted literally." In a Protestant of ordinary knowledge, this would have been nothing astonishing; but Lord Macaulay's reading was so universal, and his power of retaining what he read so marvellous, that it is impossible he should not, somewhere or other, have met with the statement, that to Catholics the rule of faith is whatever the Church teaches; and hardly less possible, if he had, that that fact should have been the only one among the multitudes of those of which he read, which he had forgotten. It is plain, then, that it was a fact so entirely out of the way of his experience, out of the way of thinking and speaking of all whom he met, that although he read it, his mind had never really mastered it, and presented it to itself as a fact. The words were to him words without meaning. No fact could more strongly illustrate the difficulty we have in making Protestants understand what the fundamental principle of our Faith is. It is not so much that they reject it, as that they have never brought themselves to imagine that we really hold it.

We have little doubt that the reaction from this strange delusion has led Catholics, in countries where they are brought into close relations with Protestants, to make Holy Scripture much less prominent than it has been made by their predecessors at any former time. In England, especially, other causes have, no doubt, combined to produce this effect, among which must be counted the accident that, owing to the long persecution, the Catholic clergy and the more educated laity for several generations were driven to receive their education in foreign countries, where many of them almost lost the use of their native language. For the effect of this was, that the old versions of Scripture in the English language, with which their Catholic ancestors in every age before Protestantism was invented had been familiar, became unknown to them; and, as time went on, were almost identified in the minds of the people with the Protestant versions which were founded upon them. For nothing has been more clearly proved than that the literary merit of the modern Protestant versions is due, not to the so-called Reformers, but to good Catholics, who lived and died before they were born, and by whom a translation of the Scriptures into English had been handed down from generation to generation. It had been originally made in the very first gene-

ration after the conversion of our English ancestors, by St. Augustin and the Celtic missioners from Iona. As the language developed, it was revised and adapted to its changing forms. It seems to have been familiar to all who could read, in the generation before the change of religion. Unhappily, the persecutions incited by the so-called Reformation, not only shed Catholic blood like water, but compelled the remnant of English Catholics to seek their education in foreign lands. And hence, when the martyr communities of Douay and Rheims prepared, for the use of their persecuted brethren in England, a version free from heretical taint, they had not the advantage of access to the old traditionary versions, the existence of which was probably unknown to them, but were driven to put out a new one. This, which for any men would have been an arduous task, was, of course, doubly so for them. To be banished for years from the dear familiar sound of their mother tongue, until it became to them almost a foreign dialect, in which they were not accustomed to speak or even to think, was one of the sacrifices which these venerable men had voluntarily made for their Saviour and their God. Most unreasonable and shameless it was, that the Protestants, who had driven them by persecution from their native land, and who had managed to gain for themselves the credit due to the old Catholic versions which they had corrupted, should have upbraided them because their work was not—as without a miracle it could not have been —indigenous English. But, no doubt, this circumstance has contributed with other causes, to make it less used among Catholics than the old translations, made before the change of religion, had been in their day.

Mr. Bagshawe thinks that a special and exceptional benefit will be derived in our own day if English Catholics fall back in this respect on the habit of their forefathers before Protestantism had commenced to spread over the land like the baleful smoke from the bottomless pit.

"It appears to me that the present is a time when Catholics are bound to have a proper knowledge of Holy Scriptures, and to display a great devotion towards them. The distinguishing heresy of the day is the attack on Revelation generally, and in particular on the inspiration of the Bible, which ought to bring out a peculiar spirit of loyalty towards it in the Church. On the other hand, the danger to be apprehended to faith from an extensive use of the Bible seems in a great measure to have died out with the decay of the principle of private judgment exercised on Scripture. This principle has been weighed in the balance and found wanting. All the evil that it could do has long since been done. The errors to which it gave rise have long since been confuted, so that it now seems more than ever a duty incumbent on Catholics, to make themselves familiar with the word of God, and to draw as plentifully as possible from those fountains which the Spirit of God has opened to them."

That this has not always been the feeling of all Catholics is, as the author shows, the result of Protestantism.

"The Catholic Church has always loved the written word of God. In the ages of [heathen] persecution her children thought it their duty to preserve the Holy Scripture from profanation, if necessary, at the risk of their lives. Many martyrs suffered death rather than let their sacred books fall

into Pagan hands. When, later on, the bishops were all publicly to meet in council, they placed the book of the Holy Scriptures on a throne in the midst of them. In the public offices of the Church, those marks of respect to the Book of the Gospels were introduced, which we see used in our own days. When evil times arrived, and the new framework of society was broken up, it was nothing but the constant care of the Church which preserved to us the Holy Scriptures. In the middle ages—emphatically called the ages of faith—men thought it an honour to spend their lives in copying them. They deemed no amount of time and labour too great to spend in enriching and beautifying those volumes which contained the Word of God. As they had these volumes in their hands, so also did they bear them in their hearts. Night and day you might have heard the praises of God sung in the words of Holy Scripture in a hundred monasteries. Every monk was supposed to know by heart the whole Psalter, and to carry out most literally the precept given by God to the Jews, 'and these words, which I command thee this day shall be in thy heart; and thou shalt tell them to thy children, and thou shalt meditate upon them sitting in thy house, and walking on thy journey, sleeping and rising.' Every one who was educated at all was familiar with the language of the Scriptures, so that the very words and phrases of Scripture had insinuated themselves into every kind of writing on indifferent subjects. Dr. Maitland in the lifelike account he gives of those times, tells us that the only way to understand the meaning of middle-age writers in difficult places, is by referring to the language used in the Bible.

"This shows what is the instruction of the Catholic Church about the Holy Scriptures. The time did, indeed, come when restrictions were found necessary. When every artizan began to think it his business to find a faith for himself—and a confusion of tongues was the consequence; when men were carried away by every wind of doctrine, and the 'unlearned and unstable' had come upon those things 'hard to be understood' which, S. Peter tells us, they 'wrest to their own destruction.' Then, indeed, the Church found it necessary, in some degree, to keep the Bible from the hands of those who were using it in such a manner as to profane the Holy Word of God, and to endanger their own souls. The Church therefore made certain wise regulations about reading the Scriptures, intended to direct us how to make them, as the apostle says, 'profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work,' at the same time commanding her children to apply themselves earnestly under proper guidance to the study of them. (*Conc. Trid. sess.* 5, c. i., *de Reform.*) Almost in our own times we find Pius VI. declaring that the faithful should be 'excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures, for these are the most abundant sources which ought to be left open to every one, to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, to eradicate the errors which are so widely disseminated in these corrupt times,' and praising those who had put them before the faithful 'in the language of their country,' and in a manner 'suitable to the capacity of every one.'" (p. 1.)

Our author modestly says of his own book, that its primary object is "to store the minds of our children with some of the grand thoughts and beautiful expressions which occur in the inspired writings, so that the truth of religion may not be to them naked forms of words; but may be associated with beautiful and devotional thoughts, likely to come back to them in times of trial."

He has well selected the passages by which, for this purpose, he "illustrates" the different parts of the Catechism. It is obvious that the particular

object he has in view, not being controversial but devotional, could have been better carried out, if he had had the opportunity, enjoyed by English Catholics before the so-called Reformation, of quoting from an ancient version, redolent of vernacular phrases and idioms; and which had grown up by repeated revisions, made in each successive age, rather than a new translation, made by men who had offered at the shrine of their God and their faith, not only their worldly interests and their country, but their natural familiarity with their mother tongue.

One quite original and, we are inclined to think, very happy part of our author's plan, has been to select from each of the texts chosen, two or three words which give, as it were, the key-note of its melody. He says of this: "The few words given may sometimes appear rather quaint, standing by themselves; but the object to be considered is, what words will best suggest the passage: obviously, in many cases, the *first* words would not do so at all." They seem to us well chosen; and the idea of putting them as a sort of index to the text, could only have occurred to a man practically versed in the teaching of children, and accustomed to use Scripture for that purpose. Thus the fact of our creation is illustrated from Psalm xcix. 3, and the catch-words given as an index to the text are "not we ourselves!" So the words, "reward exceeding great," recall the promise of God to Abram that God Himself would be his reward.

There is one point on which we could have wished to see the use of the texts quoted explained a little more at length; this is, as to the texts quoted in illustration of the Decalogue, and especially the third commandment. There would doubtless be nothing to be desired in a land where the Catholic religion was the tradition of the people. But the figment of the modern Scotch Protestants about the "Sabbath" has so widely spread in England (although happily in a modified form), and its effects are so lamentably demoralizing, that we should have been glad if it had been explained, even to children, that the Decalogue as a whole is binding on us, not because it was given to the Jews through Moses, but for reasons altogether different. Religious Protestants have found themselves obliged in consistency to say that all the commandments of the Decalogue, including the law of the Sabbath, are binding upon Christians, because they were part of the law of Moses This it is which the Catechism of the Council of Trent expressly and positively denies; and it is plain that nothing but the necessity of the case would have induced Protestants to fall back upon such an argument, because they consider themselves the especial disciples of S. Paul; and there is no one error which S. Paul more emphatically denounces than the notion that the law of Moses is binding upon Christians. They are compelled to defend and maintain the observance of Sunday by saying that the law of the Sabbath is binding upon Christians, simply because, if they did not, they could maintain it only by admitting the authority of the Church; and rather than admit this they will say what is subversive of their whole system, and, indeed, of Christianity itself. We cannot help thinking that on this account, among others, it is specially important that English Catholics of all classes should be made fully aware of the fact, that the law of the Sabbath is not binding

upon Christians, and that the observance of the Lord's Day rests wholly upon the authority of the Church.

Another reason we have already alluded to in saying that the Scotch, or common Protestant, notion on this subject is demoralizing. Of this we are deeply convinced. For no Christians think themselves obliged to observe strictly the Mosaic law of the Sabbath. They are taught from their childhood to believe (1) that it is a law imposed upon them by God; and (2) that they are under no obligation to observe it strictly. Of course they are thus taught by a practical example, stronger than any mere abstract principle, that the laws of God need not be strictly observed. We have known Protestants urge this argument, when the law of God, for instance on the subject of purity, has been urged upon them; as a proof that they may be saved without observing it strictly. Nor do we see how, upon their principles, their conclusion can be denied. They infer, and on them our premises correctly, tha the laws of God are expressed in strong language to frighten us, but that they are not meant to demand from us litteral obedience. Nothing of course could be more demoralizing than such a notion. Yet it follows of necessity from the Scotch doctrine of Sabbath; which is now widely prevalent among English Protestant.

Life of Madame de Beauharnais de Miramion. By M. ALFRED BONNEAU. Translated by the BARONESS DE MONTAIGNAC. Edited by LADY HERBERT. London: Bentley, 1870.

ALMOST every one who has any taste for history at all feels a special interest in biographies and memoirs relating to the reign of Louis XIV., that golden age of French history, which gave birth to so many statesmen, writers, and poets, and which was adorned by the wit and grace of so many beautiful and accomplished women. Madame de Miramion, whose most interesting life has just been published, was a person who, had she chosen to devote herself to the world, was well fitted by nature and position to preside over one of those brilliant *salons* which at that time exercised such a powerful influence over the fashionable and literary circles of Paris. She was of a noble, parliamentary family, immensely rich, and in her youth greatly admired for her beauty. She possessed judgment and talents far above the average, as is clearly proved by the many difficult undertakings she successfully carried through in her lifetime, and to make her success more sure, she was gifted with a wonderful union of sweetness and firmness, which carried all before it and made it a pleasure and a necessity for all who knew her to bend to her will. With such gifts of mind and position we can easily see of how much harm Madame de Miramion might have been the cause had she been a bad or merely a worldly woman, given up to the delights of the brilliant society in which she was placed, or at best how few traces of usefulness and goodness she would have left behind her. But, thank God, that

faith which had so firm a hold on men's minds in those days, that we see even those who, when young, gave themselves up to the pursuit of pleasure, turn, as it were, involuntarily to God before the end of their lives, and often expiate with severe penance the sins of their youth—this same faith was the rule and the guiding star of Madame de Miramion's life from her cradle to the end of her sixty-six years on earth. There were at that time, even about the licentious court of Louis XIV., many excellent and virtuous women, who combined much of piety and charity with their worldly lives, but it is only here and there that we see souls given up so completely to God, that His will is their only law, and to work for Him in His poor, the only desire of their heart, as was the case with M. de Miramion.

Marie Bonneau de Rubelle, daughter of Jacques Bonneau, Seigneur de Rubelle, King's Counsellor and Secretary, was born in Paris on the 26th November, 1629. She lost her mother when she was only nine years old, and the deep sorrow she then felt seems to have cast a shadow over her life, and made her graver and sadder than is usual in so young a child. When still quite young she wished to become a nun ; but on the death of her father, she concluded that God intended her to act as mother to her four brothers, which duty she fulfilled most faithfully from the time she was fourteen. At fifteen she was presented at Court, and a few months later was married to Jean Jacques Beauharnais, Seigneur of Miramion, counsellor to the Parliament of Paris, whom she chose from amongst other suitors on account of his goodness and piety. Fifteen seems to us an early age for marriage, but it was not then so considered. Madame de Sevigné presented her daughter at Court at sixteen, and was astonished and somewhat hurt that "la plus jolie fille de France" was still unmarried at twenty, an age which would not alarm even the most anxious mother of the present day. According to the custom still kept up in France, and which tells well for the unity of families and for the power possessed by the various members of accommodating themselves to tastes and dispositions which differ from their own, M. de Miramion took home his young wife to his grandfather's house, in which his parents, his aunt, and her only son also lived. They all treated the young bride with the unvarying affection she deserved. Madame de Miramion herself says, she never had any disagreement with them, except that they were anxious she should lead a less retired life than she herself desired. Her husband, to whom she was devoted, let her please herself on this point, and their mutual love seemed only to lead them both nearer to God. After six short months of wedded life, M. de Miramion died, leaving his widow of sixteen almost broken-hearted ; indeed, for some time, fears were felt for her life. But God, who intended by this sorrow to unite her heart more closely to Himself, gave her strength to recover ; and when her little daughter was born five months later, she felt that she still had something left for which to desire life. Soon after her child's birth Madame de Miramion caught the small-pox.

It is terrible, in reading history, to observe how very many celebrated persons before the discovery of inoculation, died of small-pox, or were marked by it for life. Madame de Miramion, who seemed indifferent to the loss of her beauty, escaped better than many of her contemporaries, and though we are told that the brilliancy of her complexion was gone, she must

still have had great charms left ; for Madame de Cornuel, seeing her at her aunt's house, in her deepest grief, said of her : "If that magnificent statue chose to prove that she is as intelligent as she is beautiful, she would turn the heads of all the Court." Madame de Miramion would not hear of a second marriage, and, like St. Jane Frances Chantal, devoted herself to her child and to the care of the poor and sick. She at one time thought, like that saint, of becoming a nun ; but the sight of her little fatherless Marie decided her to remain in the world and work there for God. The most curious episode in this interesting life, as illustrating the manners of the times, is the abduction of the young widow of nineteen by le Comte de Bussy-Rabutin, who took possession of her carriage and herself as she was on her way to Mont St. Valérien on a pilgrimage, and carried her off against her will, and in spite of her cries and entreaties, to his castle, near Sens.

M. de Bussy Rabutin was Madame de Sevigné's first cousin, and wished to have become her husband. He was chiefly renowned, during his life-time, for the authorship of some scandalous books relating to the Court, and even the King, for one of which he was imprisoned in the Bastille, and then banished to his own country seat. To posterity he is known by the brilliant letters written to him by his gifted cousin, whose name, in his spite and wounded self-love, he had not spared. But in a war of pens, even with *la plus dangereuse plume de France*, there is little need to say that Madame de Sevigné gained an easy victory, and very soon had him disarmed and prostrate at her feet ; then, in chivalrous phrase and with her peculiar grace, she writes : "Levez-vous, Comte, je ne veux pas vous tuer à terre ; ou reprenez votre épée, pour recommencer le combat." Doubtless, M. de Bussy would have felt some surprise had he known the channel through which his fame was to be preserved ; for, in his overweening vanity, he really flattered himself that his letters were superior to those of his cousin. Such was the Count who did Madame de Miramion the honour of wishing to make her his wife. Thanks to her courage and resolution, Madame de Miramion prevailed alike over force and entreaties, and although she had been more than forty hours without food, she would not eat a morsel until she had been replaced in her carriage with permission to depart. The fright and fatigue through which she had passed were the cause of a serious illness ; and it was thought necessary to give her the last sacraments. However, her life of usefulness was not so soon to come to an end. It must be said that M. de Bussy excused himself by saying he had been deceived, and made to believe the young widow was, herself, anxious to marry him, and only prevented by her friends ; and that she would be grateful to him to carry her off by force.

Many other and more agreeable offers of marriage were made to Madame de Miramion ; but she seemed to hear the voice of God speaking within her heart when she was in prayer before the Blessed Sacrament, and claiming her for his own ; and during the first retreat given by St. Vincent de Paul himself, at the convent of the Sisters of Charity, which she attended, the will of God was made even more clearly known to her in a species of vision. She herself tells us : "In the night of the 18th January, 1649, being in retreat at Madlle. Legras', and in bed, it seemed to me that some one struck me on the shoulder. I awoke, thinking it was a sister come to call

me to go to the chapel. On opening my eyes I saw a great light round my bed, as if it had been a bright sunshine. I was much surprised, thinking it was very late. I heard a voice which thrilled me through and through, and which said : 'Be not surprised ; it is I who am thy Lord and Master.' I threw myself on my knees upon my bed ; the voice continued : 'Seek no more to know My will, and be not anxious about it. I assure thee that I will have thee wholly and entirely Mine ; thy heart is not too large for me. I choose to have thee entirely to Myself, and that thou shouldst be wholly occupied in Me alone. I will be thy husband, thou shalt be My spouse ; engage thyself to Me ; give up false pleasures ; thou shalt have troubles and sorrows ; but be faithful to Me, and nothing shall harm thee. I will delight in thy humiliation, and will be in the midst of thy heart ; delay no longer, the time is come ; it is My will.'" Encouraged by these words, Madame de Miramion, after consulting her confessor and S. Vincent de Paul, took a vow of chastity, being at that time just twenty, and from that moment felt perfect security and peace in her soul. She now devoted herself more than ever to the poor, and gave up as much of her time as she could spare from her daughter to visit the sick at the Hôtel-Dieu, working hard under the direction of S. Vincent de Paul. She had a special sympathy for orphans, having herself suffered early the loss of her parents ; and this feeling made her resolve to set up an orphanage, which she called the "House of the Holy Childhood," in which she suppported twenty little girls, whom she would often teach and tend herself, taking her little daughter with her, that she might learn early to love the poor. God gave back to Madame Miramion, more than once, the life of her daughter when it seemed in the greatest danger, for she was from her infancy subject to serious illnesses ; and, in return, the thankful mother brought up her child for God, teaching her to love and serve Him, and to make, everyday, a quarter or half an hour's meditation. When Madlle. de Miramion was eight years old, she was placed by her mother in a convent to make her first communion, according to the custom of the time for young ladies of good family, and remained there until she was fourteen, at which age she married M. de Nesmond, son of Président Théodore de Nesmond. Madame de Miramion, with her only daughter, to whose health and happiness she devoted every care, reminds us somewhat of Madame de Sévigné, whose passion for Madame de Grignan glows in each one of her letters to her ; and whose grief, when her daughter married and left her, has come down to us in words of passionate lamentation ; but Madame de Sévigné's love was somewhat of the nature of idolatry, and its excess caused Arnaud d'Andilly, her intimate friend, to consider her as "une jolie païenne."

Nothing could be keener than Madame de Miramion's grief for her daughter's loss, when M. de Nesmond took her home to his father's house ; but she concealed her grief that she might not add to that of her child ; and, on parting from her, said, "Your first duty, after God, my dear child, must be to your husband. I wish you to love me, but you ought to love him more ; duty and religion oblige you to give him the first place in your heart."

When released from the care of her daughter, Madame de Miramion was able still more unreservedly to devote herself to works of charity. The first half of the seventeenth century, in spite of its pleasures and its luxuries, was

remarkable for the number of charitable institutions established to meet various pressing wants, and most of which continued to flourish until the revolution, spreading like a deluge over France, swept all things before it. In almost all the great works undertaken in her day, Madame de Miramion took a share; and so great was her liberality, that before her death she had scarcely any remains of her once large fortune. Several ladies joined with her in her work among the poor, and lived under the same roof with her, keeping a regular rule approved of by S. Vincent de Paul, and other communities of devout women were by degrees united to this first small body, which received the name of Sœurs de Ste. Génévière, or, as they were frequently called, "les Miramionnes." Madame de Miramion was elected superioress for life of this community, of what we should now call nuns, though we see, in reading her life, that she hardly considered herself as one, for at that time a "nun" was taken to mean a person belonging to an enclosed order. S. Vincent de Paul's institution of nuns, with their modesty as a veil and the streets as a cloister, was something quite unheard of before his own time. S. Francis of Sales had at first desired that his nuns of the Visitation should be uncloistered, but it was left for S. Vincent de Paul to carry out the idea; and in the present day we are all familiar with the sight of the Sister of Charity in her far-spreading white cap, threading her way through the crowded streets on her errands of love and mercy. Madame de Miramion lived through times of great trouble and misery, when the charity of those who had money to dispose of was much needed; for though at that time the arms of Louis XIV. were still victorious, and foreign armies were not, as now, occupying France, and surrounding her capital, still famine and pestilence, those sure followers of war, were everywhere making themselves felt; and even while the king's ambition was satisfied by the acquisition of new territories and the triumph of his generals, the poor of his kingdom were suffering. Military glory itself sows the seed of future sorrows; and in France at this instant, we still see the ill effects of the successes of two great periods to which the French continually refer with so much pride—those of the Grand Monarque and of Napoleon I.—in all the unspeakable suffering and grief now being endured by thousands of innocent persons.

In 1673 a pestilence broke out at Melun, brought by the troops which marched through the town, and Madame de Miramion, who had a chateau in the neighbourhood, hastened to hire a house in the town in which to receive the sick, and, with the help of the grey sisters, nursed them herself, and put to shame many who, in their fear of infection, were flying from the town. Her biographer says:—"She directed everything as if God Himself had committed to her care the salvation of this unfortunate town. Night watching, exhortations, money—nothing was spared. She was full of attention to the sick, particularly to the soldiers." "They expose their lives for us every day," she said to the nuns. "Strive, my sisters, to save them; we are all interested in it." During the famines which for more than one winter visited France and filled Paris "with a crowd of weeping poor positively dying of hunger," Madame de Miramion was indefatigable in working and begging for them, applying to Madame de Maintenon and to the King for help, and distributing every other day more than six thousand portions of soup. We have no room to do more than enumerate some of the many works of charity which

Madame de Miramion established, or had a large share in establishing, during her life, almost any one of which would have been sufficient to an ordinary person as the work and object of a lifetime. But her zeal was never satisfied as long as anything remained to be done and strength was left her to do it. She set up a House of Retreat for ladies of the world and persons of a humbler class, by which means many were reclaimed from bad lives. She was the chief means of establishing, on a permanent footing, the seminary of S. Nicholas for the education of priests, which escaped the fury of the revolutionists, and remains still as it was two centuries ago, being now united to the petit séminaire of S. Sulpice. She also opened work-rooms for the young girls of her parish, in which they were kept from harm and taught to gain their living, and some who had no home she took into the house. This plan was most successful, and was imitated at once in many other places.

After reading her life, we feel that it was not, indeed, without cause that the Duc de St. Simon says of her :—"The King had always the greatest consideration for her, which her humility made her use with prudence, and always for the good of others ; she showed alike discretion and wisdom in dealing with ministers, her ecclesiastical superiors, and the public magistrates, and may be termed the mother and guardian of the poor." And Madame de Sévigné :—"As to Madame de Miramion, that mother of the poor and of the Church, she is, indeed, a public loss." She died on the 24th of March, 1696, after a most painful illness, rendered still more suffering by the many hopeless experiments made upon her by ignorant doctors, to all of which she submitted without a complaint. For many years of her life she had been used to bear pain in silence, for she had suffered from a cancer and continual sickness, and when this is remembered, her active charity and zeal for others becomes still more wonderful. Her daughter, the Présidente de Nesmond, knelt at her mother's bedside and received her last blessing. "My dear daughter," she said to her, "do not weep ; thank God for the graces He has given you ; love Him and serve Him with all your heart ; there is nothing else worth living for ; one is very glad, when death comes, to have been altogether His. If He grants me mercy, oh, how I shall pray for you."

In the appendix to her life there are some notes of Retreats, letters, and meditations, &c., by Madame de Miramion herself, together with a short sketch of her life, written by order of her confessor. The whole book is well got up, and if, as her name seems to imply, the translators is a Frenchwoman, the English is really wonderful. It far surpasses most translations we have read, though every now and then unmistakably French phrases may be recognised ; as, indeed, several of our quotations will show. It sounds strangely when the author calls Madame Miramion's grandfather and grandmother "two respectable old people," "respectable" being used in French in a very different sense from our word respectable. It is impossible to forget the letter of the French friend of the celebrated Miss Crawley, who assures her of her constant grateful recollection of "our adorable, our respectable Miss Crawley." But such slight delicacies of language can hardly be expected to be observed by a foreigner.

We have omitted many interesting points in this volume, for which we refer our readers to the book itself.

Textile Fabrics in the South Kensington Museum. A Descriptive Catalogue of the Collection of Church Vestments, Dresses, Silk Stuffs, Needlework, and Tapestries, forming that Section of the Museum. By the Very Rev. DANIEL ROCK, D.D. Published for the Science and Art Department of the Committee of Council on Education. London: Chapman and Hall.

IT is difficult to do justice to the value and interest of this volume. It is everything a catalogue ought to be, and much more besides. Used as a hand-book it will enable the visitor to the Kensington Museum to appreciate to the full the rare and beautiful collection of which it is the valuable exponent, and it is, as a book, of captivating interest. The learned author's treatment of his various and difficult subject is extremely skilful. Accurate and minute, it is never dry, and even in the more strictly technical portion of his task, he tries to make the enumerated list of objects exhibited pleasant reading, by the aid of sympathetic remarks, suggestion, and association.

Needlework, the earliest of the arts, was, like the others, especially dedicated to the service of religion, from the days of glad obedience to the commands of the Lord God of Israel, after He had set His people free, relative to the adornment of the Tabernacle, down to the dark time in our own history, when impious iconoclastic hands stripped the sanctuaries of their precious furniture, and destroyed the work of skilful artificers and holy women, in which they had emblematically expressed the reverent fancies, the aspirations, the devotion of their souls. With the revival of the Catholic worship and its free exercise, there has come about a return to some of those majestic industries of former days, but its interest is diminished, though in some instances its results are much enhanced, by the assistance now lent to all decorative art by machinery. The fine collection, explained in its origin and details by Dr. Rock, is doubly interesting in its traditional and in its comparative point of view.

Needlework has also been the handmaid of history; and in this capacity we find it richly represented in the collection, but still more so in Dr. Rock's learned, elaborate, and exhaustive introduction, which gives the reader an account of all the renowned instances of the chronicling of events by needlework, and their importance to chronology, heraldry, and costume. The introduction to the richly annotated catalogue is so arranged that immediate reference may be made to any of its sections, while, read as a whole, it forms a continuous narrative of the origin, date, employment, and improvement of textile fabrics, under which head every kind of thread, no matter what its material, wrought in the loom, is included. "The Geography of the Raw Material," is Dr. Rock's introductory title, and his first topic is "Wool," the use of which he traces from the far East to ancient Britain. Among many interesting details relative to this textile fabric, we find the

following :—"Of the use of woollen stuff, not woven but plaited, among the older stock of the Britons, a curious instance was very lately brought to light while cutting through an early Celtic grave-hill or barrow in Yorkshire, the dead body had been wrapped, as was shown by the few unrotted shreds still cleaving to its bones, in a woollen shroud of coarse and loose fabrice wrought by the plaiting process without a loom." Next come the history of cotton, hemp, and flax, with many a passage on which we linger with delight, calling up the life, the industries of the old world. Here is one of them :—

"To the valley of the Nile must we go if we wish to learn the earliest history of the finest flaxen textiles. Time out of mind were the Egyptians famous as well for the growth of flax, as for the beautiful very fine linen they wove out of it, and which became to them a most profitable, because so widely sought for, article of commerce. Their own word 'byssus' for the plant itself, became among the Greeks, and also among the Latin nations, the term for linens wrought in Egyptian looms. Long before the oldest book in the world was written, the tillers of the ground all over Egypt had been heedful in sowing their flax, and anxious about its harvest. It was one of their staple crops, and hence was it that, in punishment of their hard-hearted Pharoah, the hail plague, which, at the bidding of Moses, showered down out of heaven, hurt throughout the land the flax just as it was getting ripe. Though the Jordan grew flax upon its banks, and all over the land that would soon belong to Abraham's children, the women there, like Rahab, carefully dried it when pulled, and stacked it for future bleaching upon the roofs of their houses; still it was from Egypt, as Solomon hints, that the Jews had to draw their fine linen. At a later period, among the woes foretold to Egypt, the prophet Isaiah warns her that they shall be confounded who wrought these in combing and weaving fine linen."

The author appeals to both the written and the material proofs of Egypt's superiority in the craft of the loom ; quoting Herodotus, description of the corselet given to the Minerva of Lindus, and of another corselet sent by Amasis to the Lacedæmonians, which was of linen, and had a vast number of animals inwoven in its fabric, and was likewise embroidered with gold *and tree wool*, which, a little later, Dr. Rock assumes to have been in reality silk. Several hundred years after the Greek historian wrote, the common belief existed that silk, like cotton, was the growth of a tree ; and the author supports his novel interpretation of the phrase used by Herodotus, by arguments as convincing as they are ingenious. He concludes his account of the mummy-cloths which furnish our material proofs of the skill of ancient Egypt, by one of those rare felicitous comparisons which lend vital interest to subjects of the kind :—

"Ages before French Flanders had dreamed of weaving fine lawns, ages before one of her industrial cities—Cambray—had so far taken the lead as to be allowed to bestow her own name in the shape of 'cambric' on the finest kind that modern European ingenuity could produce, Egypt had known how to give to the world even yet a finer sort ; and centuries after she had fallen away from her place among the kingdoms of the earth, her enthralled people still kept up their ancient superiority in spinning and

weaving their fine, sometimes transparent, byssus, of which a specimen may be seen in this collection."

Neither the Egyptians, nor the Israelites, nor any other of the most ancient nations of the earth knew of the existence of silk, either as a simple twist or as a woven stuff. No shred of silk has been found in the tombs of the Pharaohs, or amid their contemporaneous remains. Dr. Rock maintains, with Braunius ("no mean authority"), that throughout the whole Hebrew Bible no mention whatever can be found of silk, a material utterly unknown to the children of Israel, and asserts that the English authorized version mistranslates the Hebrew word, which it renders "silk," in Ezekiel xvi. 10, 13, and again in Proverbs xxxi. 22; whereas the Vulgate, by rendering it in the former passage, *subtilibus*, or *fine*, as opposed to coarse, has given the true meaning. It was long after Ezekiel's time before silk, in its raw form, made up into hanks, first found its way to Egypt, Western Asia, and Eastern Europe.

The author gives us a charming account of the origin and increase, the first emigration, and the subsequent spread, of the beautiful, and for ages most costly fabric, a narrative enriched, like the tissue he writes of, with new adornments as it goes on, with historical and classical allusions and anecdotes. After he has traced the raw silk from China to India, by the Indus, across the Arabian Ocean, up the Red Sea, and thence over the Isthmus of Suez, or, perhaps, rather by the overland route, through Persia, to the Island of Cos, while Pamphile, daughter of Plates, is reported to have first woven it, he proceeds to what we may call its social history. This constitutes one of the most interesting portions of his introductory essay.

After the transparent silken gauzes wrought in Cos, various fashions of the fabric found their way from Chinese looms to Asia Minor and Italy; and silken garments were early brought to Imperial Rome. "Such, however, were the high prices asked for them, that few either would or could afford to buy these robes for their wives and daughters; since, at first, they were looked upon as quite unbecoming for men's wear." An exception was made by some emperors for very great occasions, and both Titus and Vespasian wore dresses of silk when they celebrated at Rome their triumph over Judæa. Heliogabulus was the first emperor who adopted whole silk for his clothing; and Dr. Rock tells us of Aurelian, that neither had he in his wardrobe a garment wholly silk, nor did he give one to be worn by another. When his wife begged him to allow her to have a single mantle of purple silk, he replied, "Far be it from us to allow thread to be reckoned worth its weight in gold." Then a pound of gold was the price of a pound of silk. From the following we learn that Europe was indebted for the silkworm to the same source whence so many other blessings of a temporal nature have accrued to her, the missionary monks of the Catholic Church.

"By the Justinian Pandects, A.D. 533, a monopoly in silk-weaving was given to the court, and looms, worked by women, were set up in the palace. Thus Byzantium became, and long continued, famous for the

beauty of its silken stuffs. Still, the raw silk itself had to be brought from abroad. But the remedy was near at hand. Two Greek monks, while spending many years in China, had well learned the whole process of rearing the worm. They came home, and brought back with them a goodly number of eggs hidden in their walking staves, likely made of the hollow, tough sort of reed or tall grass, the *Arundo Donax*, and, carrying them to Constantinople, they presented these eggs to the emperor, who gladly received them. When hatched, the worms were distributed all over Greece and Asia Minor, and very soon the western world reared its own silk. Not long after Persia and India also became silk-growing countries. In some places, at least in Greece, the weaving not only of the finer kinds of cloth, but of silk, got into the hands of the Jews."

Then follows the history of the silk factory of Almeria, and of Italian silk-weaving in the eleventh century, and the extension of the industry to England, where we find, in 747, Archbishop Cuthberht reproved the practice by "nuns and ankresses" in the cloister, before the Council at Cloveshoo.

From a feeling alive in every heart throughout the length and breadth of Christendom, that the best of all things ought to be given for the service of its religious rites, the garments of its celebrating priesthood, from the far East to the uttermost West, were, if not always, at least very often, wholly of silk—"holosericus." Dr. Rock reminds us that had it not been so, "we had been at this day without the power of being able to see through the few but tattered shreds before us, what elegantly designed and gorgeous stuffs the mediæval loom could weave, and what beautiful embroidery our own countrywomen knew so well how to work. These specimens help us also rightly to understand the description of those splendid vestments and ritual appliances enumerated with such exactness in the old inventories of our venerable cathedrals and parish churches, as well as the early wardrobe accompts of our kings, and the wills and bequests of our dignified ecclesiastics and nobility."

To the history of silk succeeds that of gold thread, cloth of gold, and tissue, of silver thread, and of wire-drawing. The details of all are curious and interesting. Concerning the last we learn that "the first idea of a wire-drawing machine dawned upon a workman's mind in the year 1360, at Nuremburg; and yet it was not until two hundred years after, A.D. 1560, that the method was brought to England." In the pages devoted to "gold thread" we find a beautiful description of the magnificent frontal wrought for the high altar at Westminster Abbey, in 1271, and a transcript of the bill for the same, to be seen on the Chancellor's Roll for the year fifty-six of Henry III., which affords many curious and valuable particulars for the matter in hand. Dr. Rock is not less happy in his treatment of the romantic than of the ecclesiastical and historical sides of his subject. His pages are richly illustrated by the Arthurian and Chaucerian literature, and he interprets many obscure passages in both, by making us understand the actual and symbolic nature of the garments or materials alluded to. Under the heading of "Mixed Webs," the author gives us some very curious details, and some interesting speculations. Thus, speaking of *camaka*, a textile of much repute in the fourteenth

century, and now quite unknown, he quotes the will of Lord Despenser made in 1375, in which he bequeaths to his wife: "My great bed of blue camaka, with griffins;" and adds:—"What may have been the real texture of the stuff, thought so magnificent, we do not positively know; but, hazarding a guess, we think it to have been woven of fine camel's hair and silk, and of Asiatic workmanship." From this mixed web the author passes to another even more precious, the *cloth of Tars*, which he presumes to have been the forerunner of the now so celebrated cashmere, and to have been made of silk, mixed with the downy wool of a family of goats reared in several parts of Asia, but especially in Thibet.

Of the country whence the silken textile called velvet came, or the people who were the first to hit upon the happy way of weaving it, we know nothing, but Dr. Rock believes we are indebted for it, as well as for satin, to Central Asia, perhaps China; and that, in Europe, it was worn first in the south of Spain, and then at Lucca. The oldest piece of velvet which Dr. Rock has ever seen is a beautiful crimson cope embroidered by English hands in the fourteenth century, now kept at the college of Mount S. Mary, Chesterfield, and exhibited in 1862. He forms an ingenious supposition that fustian, a cognate fabric, may have suggested to the Italians a way of weaving silk in the same manner, and so producing velvet.

Having described the nature and the origin of textile fabrics, the author proceeds to discuss them artistically, according to their progress, their schools, and the varieties and methods of their perfection and adornment. In this section, the Spanish, Saracenic, and Sicilian schools are especially interesting. Later, we come to Florence, Venice, Milan, Flanders, and Ireland, and then to the history of changeable, and *marble* silk. The second section is devoted to embroidery, and contains an elaborate and most interesting account of the famous "Opus Anglicum" and "Opus Consutum." The third section of the Introductory Essay contains the varieties of embroidery, thread, gold and silver beads, glass, and diapering, work; and the fourth is a charming essay upon the uses of this valuable collection of ancient needle-work, to the historian, the liturgical student, and the student of symbolism. All three are combined in the author, who invests each subject with an attraction hitherto perhaps unsuspected by even careful observers of the objects he describes. No less eloquent is he upon the share which artists and manufacturers have in this study, upon its important bearing upon literature and languages, its value to heraldry, and the share claimed in it by zoology and botany.

Of the Catalogue, it suffices to say that we cannot conceive any more perfect piece of work of its kind. It is thoroughly explanatory as a hand-book to the collection, while it abounds in illustrative and suggestive notes which are welcome reading anywhere.

Lizzie Wentworth: a Story of real Life. By BENJAMIN WILSON, M.A. London: Virtue & Co. 1870.

MR. WILSON has a sad story to tell, and he tells it straight through without stopping by the way. As a work of art, perhaps, some exception might be taken against this slight tale. Of the characters, only the heroine stands out very distinctly sketched. The incidents are few; and the dialogue, of which there is a good deal, is frequently spun out rather too thinly. But we notice it because it has a purpose and suggests a moral. It is rare to find a difficult and disagreeable social question treated so purely and yet so touchingly. There are, doubtless, many reasons, partly in the nature of things, partly in the arrangements of modern society, that operate to let an immoral man go free and unpunished, and at the same time to crush down and drive to crime and death the victim of his sin. But it can do no harm that the voice of indignation should sometimes be heard. And the warning that is conveyed to the young in a piteous tale like this, is worth as much as many a sermon upon the dangers of first steps to perdition.

WE are particularly delighted to notice the appearance of the "Life and Select Writings of Grignon de Montfort, translated by a Secular Priest" (Richardson). We hope to give an article on it in our next number.

INDEX.

ALFORD (H., D.D.), The New Testament, *reviewed*, 57.

AMERICAN CHURCH (THE), 319–355 : Corporations on their trial, 319; the Church always on her trial, 320, 321 ; Church work in America, 322 ; characteristics of the New England States, 323, 324 ; Puritan legislation against the Church, 325 ; the Plymouth Code, 326 ; the Blue Laws of Massachusetts, 327–329 ; the Puritans and the Indians, 330, 331 ; their system of slavery, 332 ; infidelity and superstition at present existing in New England, 333 ; the Church in Massachusetts, 334 ; the dioceses of Boston, Hartford, Providence, Portland, and Burlington, 335, 336 ; progress of the Church in the State of New York, 337–339 ; the Church in Virginia and Maryland, 340, 341 ; Catholic institutions of Maryland, 342, 343 ; character of the American Protestant Episcopal Church, 344, 345 ; the Church in the Valley of the Mississippi, 347 ; in the North-Western States, 348, 349 ; in the Western and South-Western States, 350 ; estimate of the numbers and nationalities of American Catholics, 351 ; the native Indians, 352 ; conversions in America, 353 ; general respect of Americans for the Catholic Church, 354, 355.

ASSUMPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY (THE), AN APOSTOLICAL TRADITION, 393–430 : The Council and the doctrine of the Assumption, 394 : character of Vaccari's work, 395, 396 ; scope of the present paper, 397 ; the term Assumption, 398 ; liturgical proof, 399–401 ; proofs from the Office, 402–404 ; Suarez as a test of the Schola, 405 ; universality of the festival, 406–409 ; the Homilies, 410, 411 ; objections from S. Ildephonsus and others, 412–415 ; doctrine of the fifth and sixth centuries, 416 ; tradition alike constant and complete, 417 ; traceable to fourth century, 418–421 ; contained in one of the two Rules of Faith, 422, 423 ; Dr. Newman on a passage in the Apocalypse, 424–426 ; relation of the doctrines of the Assumption and Immaculate Conception, 427, 428 ; reasons for desiring a Definition, 429.

AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, 57–85 : This controversy one of very ancient date, 57 ; closed for Catholics in some degree by the Council of Trent, 58 ; evidence of S. Clement of Rome, 59 ; S. Irenæus and Novatian, 60 ; the African Church, 61 ; words of S. Jerome, 61–63 ; authority of S. Augustine, 64, 65 ; Clement of Alexandria, 65 ; the

Alexandrian writers, 66 ; two sayings of Origen, 67 ; Dean Alford's commentary thereon, 67, 68 ; other Fathers of the Eastern Church, 69, 70 ; S. John Chrysostom, 71 ; Cajetan and Erasmus, 72 ; summary of the evidence, 73, 74 ; genesis of the doubt, 75 ; knowledge of the early Christians, 76, 77 ; alleged discrepancies, 78, 79 ; their explanation, 80 ; Professor Hug's evidence, 81 ; the Greek text, 82 ; conclusion, 83–85.

Bagot (Dean), Translation of Horace's Art of Poetry, *noticed*, 267.
Bagshawe (Rev. John B.), The Catechism illustrated, *noticed*, 522.
Bayley (Rev. J. R.), A Sketch of the History of the Church in New York, *reviewed*, 319.
Bill to provide Elementary Education, *reviewed*, 122.
Bonneau (M.), Life of Mdme. de Miramion, *noticed*, 528.
Bottalla (F.), The Pope and the Church in their Mutual Relations, *noticed*, 236.
Brownson (O. A.), Conversations on Liberalism and the Church, *noticed*, 244.
Butler (Thaddeus, D.D.), The Catholic Church in America, *reviewed*, 319.

Case (Dr.), The Vatican Council, a Sermon, *noticed*, 242.
Ce qui se passe au Concile, *noticed*, 241.
Chocarne (Rev. P.), Inner Life of P. Lacordaire, *reviewed*, 356.
Chronicle of Evesham Abbey, 26–56 : General value of the collection of the Master of the Rolls, 26, 27 ; S. Egwyn founds the Abbey of Evesham, 27 ; the monks driven out by Aldhelm, 28 ; Aelfward rescues the church from Godwin, 29 ; William the Conqueror protects Evesham, 30 ; Roger Norreys, 31 ; the monks appeal against his rule, 32 ; Thomas of Marlborough, 33 ; the monks resist the bishop, 34 ; the bishop suspends and excommunicates the monks, 35 ; the archbishop treats the excommunication as of no effect, 36 ; an appeal to Rome prosecuted, 37 ; the action tried at Worcester, 38 ; the archbishop proceeds to Evesham, 39 ; Pontifical commission appointed, 40 ; the parties proceed to Rome, 41 ; their proceedings at Rome, 42, 43 ; they leave Rome, 44 ; decision of the delegates, 45 ; Thomas's pleading, 46, 47 ; Robert of Clipston's reply, 47, 48 ; the Pope's sentence, 49 ; case of the churches of the Vale, 50, 51 ; Thomas leaves Rome, 52 ; the abbot and his monks, 53 ; the legate goes to Evesham, 54 ; the legate removes Roger, 55 ; Thomas of Marlborough becomes abbot, 56.
Church (R. W.), S. Anselm, *noticed*, 513.
Constitutio Dogmatica Prima de Ecclesia Christi, 496.
Constitutio Dogmatica de Fide Catholicâ, 208.
Constitutio Dogmatica de Fide Catholicâ, *reviewed*, 186.
Convent Committee, The, 271–299 : Mr. Newdegate's majority of March 30, 271 ; appointment of his Committee, 272 ; Mr. Gladstone's motion, 273 ; Mr. Gladstone's proposed committee, 274 ; newspaper rumours, 275 ; Doctor Newman on Protestant prejudice, 276 ; the *Spectator* on the popular dislike of monasteries, 277 ; career of Mr. Murphy, 278,

279; the liberty of nuns, 280, 281; the prejudice against Catholic liberty, 282, 283; the *Saturday Review* on Mr. Newdegate's view, 284; Doctor Newman on the Christianity of the Bible, 285, 286; Mr. Gladstone's speech, 287; difficulty of Mr. Gladstone's position, 288, 289; meaning of his compromise, 290; Mr. Newdegate's conduct in Committee, 291; the case of the Oratorians, 292-294; effect of existing laws on Catholic charities, 295; Mr. Hobhouse's evidence, 296; Mr. Harting's evidence, 297; case of the Irish Establishment, 298; adjournment of the Committee, 299.

COUNCIL, THE, 186-207: Great importanoe of the First Dogmatic Constitution, 186; it implies infallibility, and refers to the multitude of the Pope's ex cathedrâ judgments, 187; the chapters on God and Revelation, 188, 189; the chapter on Faith, 189, 190; the chapter on Faith and Reason, 190, 191; practical exhortation, 191, 192; tactics of the opposition, 192; question of unanimity or majority, 193; novelty of this question, 194; the Papacy, the normal seat of infallibility, 195; the term "moral unanimity," 196; case of the Pope with a majority, 197; case of the Pope with a minority, 198, 199; the Vincentian Canon, 200; Pope Pius IV. on unanimity, 201, 202; the schema of the North American Bishops, 203; Dom Gueranger's argument, 205-207.

Crolly (Professor), Disputationes Theologicæ, *noticed*, 254.

DISRAELI (Right Hon. B.) Lothair, *reviewed*, 156.
Dogmatic Constitution of the Catholic Faith, 209.

EARLE (J. C.), A Hundred Sonnets, *noticed*, 266.

EDUCATION BILL (THE), 122-155: Attitude of Secularists towards the Government measure, 122, 123; attitude of the Dissenters, 124, 125; the time-table Conscience Clause, 126, 127; amendments proposed to the Bill, 128; views of the *Spectator* and *Times*, 129-131; differences of English sects, 132, 133; conference of metropolitan school teachers, 134, 135; real creed of the Secularists, 136, 137; Secularism abroad, 138; Mr. Gladstone's proposed amendments, 139; power of school boards, 140, 141; Privy Council aid, 142; probable practical working of the Bill, 143, 144; question of compulsion, 145; the peculiar position of Catholics, 146, 147; Archbishop Whately's evidence, 148; State assistance, 149; exertions already made by Catholics, 151, 152; Conscience Clause as regards Catholics, 153; conclusion, 154, 155.

FALL OF THE FRENCH EMPIRE (THE), 479-495: Appalling suddenness of the Empire's collapse, 479; connection of Sedan with French history, 480; destruction of the French army, 481; its causes, 482, 483; amazing growth of the Prussian power, 484; the causes thereof, 485; singular efficiency of all its great officials, 486; failure of the Emperor's faculty, 487, 488; character of the Revolution, 489; its prophet Voltaire, 490; the Voltaire statue and Voltarian government, 491; present state of

France, 492; predictions concerning France, 493; the Revolution at Rome, 494, 495.

Falloux (Comte de), Correspondance du R. P. Lacordaire, *reviewed*, 356.
First Dogmatic Constitution of the Church of God, 497.
Foisset (M.), Vie du R. P. Lacordaire, *noticed*, 247.
——— Vie du R. P. Lacordaire, *reviewed*, 356.
Franzelin (F.), Tractatus de Verbo Incarnato, *noticed*, 242.

Gallwey (F.), S. Joseph and the Vatican Council, *noticed*, 239.
Gasparini (F.), The Attributes of Christ, *noticed*, 258.
Greenwood (J.), Seven Curses of London, *reviewed*, 1.
Guéranger (Dom), Defence of the Roman Church, *noticed*, 262.

Historical Map of the War, *reviewed*, 479.
Hunter (F. Sylvester, S.J.), Theses Dogmaticæ, *reviewed*, 393.

Jane Austen and her Novels, 430-457: Modest obscurity of Miss Austen's life, 430; her fame posthumous, 431; her family circle, 432; her favourite studies, 433; her admiration of Richardson, 434; characteristics of her style, 435; her female characters, 436; comparison with Thackeray, 437; with Mrs. Gaskell, 438; her powers of description, 437–439; comparison with Trollope, 440; her view of novels, 441; her idea of Shakespeare, 442; her female characters, 443; comparison with Goldsmith, 444, 445; her plots, 446; Mrs. Norris and Lady Bertram, 447, 448; "Mansfield Park" and "Emma," 449: Miss Austen's "fools," 450; the end of her stories, 451; her clerical portraits, 451-456; Mr. Leigh's Memoir, 457.

Janus, The Pope and the Council, *reviewed*, 393.

Knox (F.), When does the Church speak Infallibly? *noticed*, 238.

Lacordaire and the Conferences of Notre Dame, 356–393: Lacordaire preaches at Rome, 356; subject of his Sermon, 357; his religious attitude, 358, 359; his independence of nature, 360, 361; his personal character, 362; state of France in Lacordaire's youth, 363; impure and infidel literature, 364; his ordination in 1830, 365; character of his genius, 366; his belief in the future of France, 367; his parting with Lamennais, 368; his first Sermon at S. Roch, 369; his Conferences at the College Stanislas, 370; Mgr. Quélen's Lenten Station, 371; Lacordaire's first Conferences at Notre Dame, 372; the series of Conferences, 373; Lacordaire's relation to his audience, 374-376; his picture of a priest, 377, 378; his treatment of reason, faith, and Scripture, 379; the Conferences on Catholic doctrine and on society, 380; the Conferences on Jesus Christ, 381, 382; the Conferences of 1848, 383; a subsequent series of Conferences, 384, 385; his conversions, 386, 387; qualities of his oratory, 388, 389; his use of history, 390; characteristics of his style, 391; his personal appearance in the pulpit, 392, 393.

Lacordaire (R. P.), Œuvres du, *reviewed*, 356.

Land Bill (the) and the Lords, 178–185 : Present position of the Irish Land Bill, 178, 179 ; actual condition of Ireland, 180 ; analysis of the Land Bill, 181 ; Lord Dufferin's speech on the Peasant Proprietary clauses, 182 ; the Irish Chancellor's elevation to the Peerage, 183 ; services rendered by English and Scotchmen to the study of the Land Question, 184 ; present temper of the Irish nation, 185.

Lasteyric (Mad.), Vie de Madame de Lafayette, *reviewed*, 85.

Lee (Dr.) on Anglican Orders, 110–122 : General character of Doctor Lee's book, 110 ; the Anglican form of Ordination and Consecration, 111, 112 ; Doctor Lee on the effects of Baptism, 113, 114 ; his doctrine of intention, 115 ; Barlow's case, 116 ; date of his consecration, 117 ; value of the evidence produced by Dr. Lee, 118 ; the case of Parker, 119 ; the argument of constant tradition, 120 ; Dr. Lee really proves that the Anglican Church is in schism, 121, 122.

Leigh (J. E. Austen-), A Memoir of Jane Austen, *reviewed*, 430.

Lewis (David), Life of S. Teresa, *noticed*, 248.

Life of S. Stanislas Kotska, *noticed*, 263.

Lopez (F.) on the Irish Trinitarians, 299–318 : Curious character of Lopez's work, 299 ; general division of the book, 300 ; the alleged Irish Trinitarian cardinals, 301, 302 ; the alleged Archbishop Hervey of Dublin, 303 ; the three Trinitarian martyrs of Amara, 304 ; the Irish Trinitarian houses, 304, 305 ; the English Trinitarians, 305, 306 ; the Crutched Friars, 306, 307 ; persecution of Trinitarians under Henry VIII., 307, 308 ; testimony of Philip O'Sullivan and Richard Goold, 309, 310 ; the convent of Limerick, 311, 312 ; alleged persecution of other convents, 313 ; persecution of Trinitarians in England 314, 315 ; Lopez's tale of Cromwell at Canterbury, 316 ; his statements, almost without exception, devoid of foundation, 317 ; origin of the forgeries, 318.

Lopez (Fr. Domingo), Noticias Historicas, *reviewed*, 299, 319.

Lothair, 156–178 : The morality of its design, 156 ; its avowed personality, 157 ; Mr. Disraeli's previous offences of this kind, 158 ; its unworthiness of his character as a statesman, 159 ; the book considered as an attack on the Catholic Church, 160 ; first inception of its design, 161 ; the Revolutionary Epick, 162, 163 ; plagiary of its principal character, 164 ; literary cleptomania, 165 ; Olympia and Theodora, 166 ; Mirandola and Colonna, 167, 168 ; comparison in detail, 169 ; Mr. Disraeli's view of the Catholic Church, 170 ; Lothair considered as a work of proverbial philosophy, 172 ; Mr. Disraeli and the Queen's English, 174 ; Mr. Disraeli and the Papacy, 175–178.

Macray (W. D., M.A.), Chronicon de Evesham, *reviewed*, 26.

McSherry (Richard), Early History of Maryland, *reviewed*, 319.

MEMOIRS OF MADAME DE LAFAYETTE AND MADAME DE MONTAGU, 85–109 : Recent reaction of sympathy towards the elder Bourbons, 85 ; recent memoirs of the revolutionary period, 86 ; the French noblesse before the Revolution, 87 ; character of the Duke d'Ayen, 88 ; Madame d'Ayen, 89 ; her marriage, 90 ; her training of her daughters, 91 ; Viscount de Noailles, 92 ; Lafayette's retirement, 93 ; the Maréchal de Mouchy, 94 ; his trial and execution, 95, 96 ; death of Madame de Noailles, 97, 98 ; character of Madame de Lafayette, 99, 100 ; her death, 101 ; literary merit of the memoir of Madame de Montagu, 102 ; her life in Switzerland, 103 ; Monsieur and Madame de Tessé, 104 ; l'Œuvre des Emigrés, 105, 106 ; death of Madame de Montagu, 107, 108 ; Abbé Carron, 109.

Montagu, A. P., Marquise de, *reviewed*, 85.

Montalembert (Comte de), Testament du P. Lacordaire, *noticed*, 247.

———————— Testament du P. Lacordaire, *reviewed*, 356.

OAKELEY (Canon), Landing of S. Augustine, *noticed*, 264.

Oliver (Peter), The Puritan Commonwealth, *reviewed*, 319.

PARIS et les Pères du Vatican, *noticed*, 241.

PROTESTANT LONDON, 1–26 : Special value of Mr. Greenwood's book, 1 ; the case of neglected children, 2–4 ; mothers of neglected children, 5 ; the chapter on baby-farming, 6 ; working boys and professional thieves, 7, 8 ; drunkenness, 9, 10 ; origin of such a state of society, 11, 12 ; analogy of Roman society, 12, 13 ; Christian civilization, 13, 14 ; Protestantism and heathenism, 14, 15 ; Catholic vocations, 16 ; case of a young priest near Drury Lane, 17 ; overcrowded habitations, 18 ; London churches in Catholic and Protestant times, 18, 19 ; church decoration, 20 ; the modern Catholic churches in this regard, 21 ; property of the Church in London, 22 ; population of Paris, 23 ; effects of the Revolution, 24 ; effects of the cheap press, 25 ; office of the Church in England, 26.

Protestant Episcopal Church (The), *reviewed*, 319.

QUIRINUS, Letters from Rome on the Council, *noticed*, 241.

RELIGIOUS Reading-Book for Catholic Schools, *noticed*, 265.

Report of the Evidence on Conventual Institutions, *reviewed*, 271.

Rhodes (M. J.), The visible Unity of the Church, *reviewed*, 457.

Rock (Daniel D.D.), Textile Fabrics in Kensington Museum, *noticed*, 534.

Roman Documents, 225.

Rose (Stewart), Ignatius Loyola and the early Jesuits, *noticed*, 510.

SCARAMELLI (J. B.), Directorium Asceticum, *noticed*, 255.

Sermons by Fathers of the Society of Jesus, *noticed*, 256.

Sweetman (W.), The Infallibility of the Pope, *noticed* 262